Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/nseclecticreview13greauoft

THE

ECLECTIC REVIEW

MDCCCXLIII.

JANUARY — JUNE.

Φιλοσοφίαν δὲ οὐ τὴν Στωικὴν λέγω, οὐδὲ τὴν Πλατωνικὴν, ἢ τὴν Ἐπικουρεῖον τε καὶ Ἀριστοτελικήν· ἀλλ' ὅσα εἴρηται παρ' ἑκάστῃ τῶν αἱρεσέων τούτων καλῶς, δικαιοσύνην μετὰ εὐσεβοῦς ἐπιστήμης ἐκδιδάσκοντα, τοῦτο σύμπαν το ΕΚΛΕΚΤΙΚΟΝ φιλοσοφίαν φῆμι. — CLEM. ALEX. *Strom.* L. 1.

NEW SERIES.

VOL. XIII.

LONDON:

THOMAS WARD & CO., PATERNOSTER ROW.

W. OLIPHANT AND SON, EDINBURGH;

JAMES MACLEHOSE, GLASGOW.

1843.

6220
15/10/90

THE

ECLECTIC REVIEW

For JANUARY, 1843.

Art. I. 1. *An Apology for the Lollard Doctrines, attributed to Wicliffe. Now first printed from a Manuscript in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin. With an Introduction and Notes*, by James Henthorn Todd, D.D., V.P.R.I.A., Fellow of Trinity College, and Treasurer of St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin. London: printed for the Camden Society. 1842. Introduction, pp. lxiii; pp. 206.

2. *The Last Age of the Church.* By John Wycliffe. Now first printed from a Manuscript in the University Library, Dublin. Edited with Notes, by James Henthorn Todd, D.D., Fellow of Trinity College, and Treasurer of St. Patrick's Cathedral. Dublin: at the University Press. 1840.

3. *Diatribe in Johannis Wicliffi, Reformationis Prodromi, Vitam, Ingenium, Scripa.* Auctore, S.A.J. De Ruever Groneman, Theol. Doct. Trajecti ad Rhenum, apud Rob. Natan. 1837. 8vo. pp. 283.

Archbishop Ussher was a great collector of manuscripts, and among his liberal contributions to the library of Trinity College, Dublin, are several volumes of Wycliffe manuscripts. In one of those volumes is this exposition and defence of Lollardism, now first printed, and edited by Dr. Todd. The volume 'is in vellum, containing two hundred and nineteen leaves, each $6\frac{2}{3}$ inches by $4\frac{2}{3}$, a full page having thirty-one or thirty-two lines, very neatly and accurately written, in the usual secretary hand of the fourteenth, or the beginning of the fifteenth century; the last leaf is wormed, and the volume ends imperfectly.' The manuscripts in this volume are by no means the most valuable in the collection of Wycliffe's writings preserved in Trinity College, and the pieces included in it vary in extent as much as in interest, the treatise now printed consisting of more than eighty

pages, while several others do not exceed a single page, or a single leaf. Altogether, they number twenty-nine pieces, of which Dr. Todd has given the titles so far as it was practicable to do so.

But concluding his description of the tract numbered XXIII., Dr. Todd says—

'All the foregoing treatises, from No. XVI. to this inclusive, appear to have been omitted in the lists of Wycliffe's writings.'

The treatises thus referred to are described as follows:—

'XVI. Of Antechristis song in chirche. XVII. Of Praier a tretys. XVIII. Nota de Confessione. XIX. A tract without title, beginning, 'Crist forsoothe did all that he couthe to obeye lordis, and mekely and softly speke to hem.' XX. A tract entitled, 'Nota de sacramento altaris.' This title has been blotted with ink by a modern hand, so, however, that the words are still legible. XXI. A tract without title, beginning, 'Crisostom seith, that fischers and buystouse men, makyinge iche daye nettis,' &c. XXII. Another tract without title, beginning, 'Seynt Barnard spekith thus: Eugenye the Pope,' &c. XXIII. A tract without title, beginning, 'God moueth hooly chirche bi many manner of spechis to knowe the truethe of this lawe,' &c.

Dr. Vaughan's account of the volume to which these notices relate, is as follows:—

'Another volume in the same library contains a MS. intitled, 'Of apostasy and the possessions of clerks.' The volume further contains the following tracts:—*Of Pseudo Friars. Of the eight woes which God wished to Friars. Of Antichrist and his ways. Of Antichrist's Song in the Church. A Treatise of Prayer. A Treatise on Confession. A Tract of Christian obedience*, beginning, 'Christ forsooth did all that he could to obey lords.' In the volume there are several separate homilies, meditations on various subjects, and a short treatise beginning, 'How are questions and answers put that are written hereafter.' The collection forms a duodecimo volume of about four hundred pages, written with a very small, but legible character. Class C., Tab. 5, No. 6.*

It will be seen by comparing the above extracts, that of the eight pieces described by Dr. Todd as hitherto 'omitted in the lists of Wycliffe's writings,' four have been described, and with their proper titles, by Dr. Vaughan; of the other four, there are three which have no titles, but which, from Dr. Todd's own list, appear to have been in the main justly described by Dr. Vaughan as 'separate homilies and meditations'—the first consisting of one leaf, the second of five, and the last of two; and with regard to

* Life and Opinions of Wycliffe. Vol. II., p. 392. Second Edition.

the one remaining piece, we may suppose that Dr. Todd has been more fortunate than Dr. Vaughan in being able to decipher a title which 'some modern hand has endeavoured to blot out.'

It is plain, then, that Dr. Todd has put forth a statement in this case, in respect to a matter of fact, which proves to be the contrary of fact. How are we to account for this? Is it to be ascribed to ignorance? Not to ignorance assuredly. Dr. Todd is a fellow of Trinity College, Dublin; he is a person whose tastes dispose him to black letter studies; and during the last seven years, the Wycliffe MSS. in Dublin have been an object of particular attention with him. The result has been a series of papers, which have appeared from time to time in the 'British Magazine,' in which the writer has appeared to find his great and constant pleasure in endeavouring to depreciate the ill-paid labours, and hardly earned reputation of Dr. Vaughan, as author of 'The Life and Opinions of Wycliffe.' One of these papers relates to the contents of this very volume, and the burden of it is a censure of Dr. Vaughan, either on account of what he has said concerning the volume, or on account of what he has failed to say concerning it.

Ignorance, therefore, is out of the question. Shall we, then, say that Dr. Todd has put forth a statement as being fact, which he must have known at the time to have been the contrary of fact? That would be a grave charge to prefer against the fellow of a college, the treasurer of St. Patrick's Cathedral, and the vice-president of the Irish Antiquarian Society. But we request our readers to look to what is now before them, and they have our free consent to devise escape for Dr. Todd from that heavy reproach, if they can. We can only say that we have read the above passages again and again, to see how such a conclusion may be avoided, and how to avoid it we find not.

We at first thought it possible that this manifest misrepresentation might have resulted from some oversight or forgetfulness. But on looking further into the matter, we do not see how that plea can be for a moment admitted, inasmuch as the introduction now printed along with this Lollard treatise, contains a reference to the paper in the 'British Magazine,' in which Dr. Todd had given his account of the volume of MSS. from which this treatise has been selected, and in that account Dr. Todd has transcribed and printed the above extract from Dr. Vaughan's book, and that for the purpose of indulging in his usual strain of comment upon it! It will appear also, presently, that this is not the only instance in which Dr. Todd's prejudices have prompted him to put forth statements of this strange description.

Concerning the publication before us, we are of opinion that

this manuscript ought not to have been attributed to the pen of Wycliffe. Our reasons are the following:—

I. Dr. Todd remarks concerning it, 'that it appears, from several expressions, to have been delivered to an assembly of judges, before whom the author was called upon to defend his opinions.' Supposing this to be so, we are at a loss to perceive on what occasion in the life of Wycliffe, he would have been likely to have prepared such a paper. The occasions on which his opinions came under the notice of 'an assembly of judges,' were in 1377 and 1378, and again in 1381 and 1382. In 1377 he appeared before the convocation in London, in company with the Duke of Lancaster and Earl Percy. Six months later he appeared again before the clergy at Lambeth. But the paper prepared in exposition and defence of his opinions at that time, was prepared in Latin, was delivered to his judges, and has been preserved. We hear nothing of any other paper of the same description as produced at that juncture; nor is it probable that any paper supplied by the reformer at that period would have exhibited the matured system of Lollardism presented in the document now edited by Dr. Todd. In 1381, the authorities in Oxford censured the doctrine of Wycliffe, but their censure was confined to the doctrine of the eucharist, and the judgment passed on the reformer's doctrines in the clerical assembly convened in the Grey Friars' Church in London, in the following year, was simply a judgment upon certain opinions, in order to the instituting of proceedings against the persons who should be suspected of holding them. Neither Wycliffe, nor any other supposed delinquent, was cited to appear before the authorities who then acted as judges.

But this difficulty of seeing on what occasion Wycliffe was likely to have prepared an extended and elaborate document of this kind, would not, we confess, be an insuperable difficulty with us did it stand alone, but taken with other circumstances, it has considerable weight in our judgment.

II. Our next objection to the notion that this document is from the pen of Wycliffe, is grounded on the complexion of the document itself. Dr. Todd speaks of the 'moderation of its tone,' as being a feature of the treatise favourable to his notion of its being a work of the reformer. But in this dispassionateness, observable as it is, with so little exception, through so long a document, we see strong evidence on the side of an opposite conclusion. From this cause the work is found to be singularly devoid of all reference to contemporary character and circumstances. If written by Wycliffe, it must have been written, as Dr. Todd elsewhere intimates, toward the close of the reformer's history,—

sometime, we should say, within the last seven years of his life, and those years were all passed amidst great change, incessant labour, and much excitement. Almost everything written by the reformer at that period bears this impress from the times, and from his own feelings as affected by passing events. Hence his English pieces, which were mostly written during that interval, contain frequent references to recent or passing occurrences, by means of which, it has been found possible to determine the dates of much the greater part of them.* The schism in the papacy, which began in 1378; the crusade on that account which took place in 1383; the translation of the Scriptures into the vernacular tongue, and the controversy which it called forth from about 1381; the insurrection of the commons during that year; the controversy raised from about that time by Wycliffe's novel opinions concerning the eucharist, and by the conduct of his missionary, or 'preaching priests,' and the various proceedings publicly instituted against his doctrine and followers. These are the sort of contemporary facts to which allusion is made, and made so frequently and passionately in the writings of Wycliffe belonging to the period adverted to, that no mind of any sagacity, we should have thought, could have passed from the perusal of those pieces, to a careful examination of the document now printed, without being conscious of the marked want of these characteristics. Wycliffe wrote nothing in English half so extended, the date of which it has not been easy to ascertain; nor has he anywhere treated the same topics, in anything like the same extent, without more frequent and powerful outbreaks of feeling.

III. Our third objection to the assumed authorship of this manuscript, has respect to the language or dialect in which it has been written. On this point, Dr. Todd remarks:—

'There is another source of internal evidence from which it is possible that some light might be thrown upon this question—at least, so far as indicating the shire or province in which the author lived. This, however, is a subject which the editor, being an Irishman, is necessarily incompetent to investigate; and he has therefore thought it safer to leave the discussion of it to others, than to undertake it, entering upon it with such imperfect information as he might perhaps have gleaned from books. He felt also that the attempt to fix the locality of an author of the fourteenth century, from the provincial idioms to be found in his writings, must in every case be somewhat precarious, unless we can be supposed to have fully satisfied ourselves that the phrases which are now found to characterize a particular shire, were all peculiar to that shire five centuries ago.'

* Life and Opinions of Wycliffe, vol. i., Note, pp. 381, 382, *et alibi*. Second edition.

This passage is characteristic of Dr. Todd's mind; it exhibits some appearance of acumen, but the acumen fails to reach its proper object. The question is not whether the dialect of the north of England now, was its dialect four centuries ago; nor whether the dialect of the north of England then, was not also the dialect of the south,—though even an Irishman might have been able, with no great difficulty, to make some way toward the solution of these questions; but the point in the present case is,—are there differences of dialect, differences such as to bespeak a *distinct authorship, between the most accredited works of the reformer, and the treatise now attributed to him?* On this point Dr. Todd might have found materials for a judgment without quitting the sister island, and even without passing beyond the walls of Trinity College, Dublin. The following terms, as terms of dialect, occur uniformly in this treatise:—'swilk' for 'such;' 'wilk' for 'which;' 'tan,' or 'tane,' for 'taken;' 'ilk' for 'same;' 'ken' for 'teach,' or 'know;' 'mikil' for 'much;' 'kirk' for 'church.' It were easy to extend this list. But in all these instances, where the author of the treatise uses the former terms, Wycliffe, in his translation of the New Testament, and in his writings generally, uses the latter terms. There may be some exceptions to this rule, but such is the rule distinguishing the dialect of the treatise from the language of Wycliffe's acknowledged works; and concerning the more marked of the above terms, we may venture to say, that while they occur constantly in the treatise, they never occur in the genuine writings of the reformer. Thus the term 'kirk' occurs in *all* cases in the treatise, excepting one, where it appears as part of a quotation. But in Wycliffe's New Testament that term *never* occurs, and it will not be found, we think, in his writings. The same may be said of many similar terms.

IV. But our strongest ground of objection to the assumption that Wycliffe was the author of this treatise, relates to portions of the matter contained in the work. Dr. Todd says, 'the treatise contains nothing inconsistent with the supposition that Wycliffe was its author.' But we feel obliged to demur to this conclusion. On the doctrine of the eucharist the author of the treatise expresses himself thus:—

'This is that we say, and in all manner strive to prove, the sacrifice of the kirk to stand together in two things, and to be made in two things together; that is, the visible species of elements, and the invisible flesh and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; sacrament and thing of the sacrament,—that is, the body of Christ; as the person of Christ standeth together of God and man, for he is very God and man; for ilk thing containeth in itself the nature of those things that it is made of; this thing that is seen is bread, and the cup that the eyes schewen;

but this that the faith asketh to be informed the bread is the body of Christ. Also the decree saith, I, Beringary, consent to the holy kirk of Rome, and as the apostle saith, I acknowledge from the mouth and heart, me to hold the same faith of the sacrament of the Lord's board, the worshipful Sir Nicol, pope in his holy synod, he hath be tane me of authority of the gospel, and of the apostle, and hath fermed to me the *bread* and *wine* that are put in the altar, to be after the consecration, *not only sacrament, but very body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ sensibly, not only in sacrament, but in truth to be treated, with hands of the priest to be broken, and with the teeth of faithful men.*'—pp. 47, 48.

In this passage we have not retained all the old orthography, and the parts in italics we have so marked. Dr. Todd refers to the passage as a denial of transubstantiation, but as the assertion of a real presence. It would, however, we suspect, greatly perplex any man to distinguish between this alleged assertion of nothing more than a real presence, and an assertion of the doctrine of transubstantiation itself; and though Wycliffe refers to the famous canon, *Ego Berengarius*, as though in some way favourable to his doctrine, his reference to it is obscure, he does not cite the canon, and does not adopt its language as *expressive of his own faith*, as is done by the author of this treatise.

Our persuasion is, that Wycliffe's reference to the canon, *Ego Berengarius*, both in his Trialogus, and in one other connexion, should be interpreted as an appeal to it, not as expressing his own opinion, but as being an act of the church which marked the time of her departure from the ancient faith on that subject, the time which he describes as that of the loosing of Satan after the restraint of a thousand years. Dr. Todd describes the passage as 'in full agreement with the doctrine maintained by Wycliffe in the *Trialogus*, lib. c. 2, seq.' Since this statement came under our notice, we have again read the nine chapters in the fourth book of the *Trialogus*, which relate to this subject, and the result is a conviction that the statement of Dr. Todd is not correct. Wycliffe concludes the discussion of this topic in his fourth chapter with these words:—'It is manifest from the aforesaid conclusions that this venerable sacrament is in its own nature true bread, and sacramentally the body of Christ.'* It is true, he speaks of the sacrament which he describes as being 'naturally very bread,' as being 'sacramentally and truly the body of Christ.' But he is careful to reiterate that by 'truly,' in this connexion, is meant a true 'sign' or 'figure,' as John was the figure of Elias, and as the rock of the wilderness was a figure of Christ. It is even said that the bread, as used in this sacrament, is 'exalted to a

* 'Et patet fidelitas conclusionis prædicta, quod hoc sacramentum venerabile est in natura sua verus panis, et sacramentaliter corpus Christi.'

more worthy substance;' but it is affirmed, in the same sentence, that the nature of the bread is not changed by its being put to this high and sacred use. The doctrine of the 'identification' or 'impanation' of the body of Christ with the bread, he declares to be 'impossible and heretical,' denouncing it as fraught with the 'most detestable idolatry,' and as a notion which would degrade the Divinity to a level with 'the basest things in the world.' In the last chapter, on the question, 'Whether two bodies may be in the same place?' he speaks of some as understanding 'that the body of Christ is in the host corporally, substantially, and essentially.' This he denies altogether, alleging that the body of Christ is there 'spiritually, and in a manner, essentially distinguished from the substance of the bread.'*

It must be obvious, we think, that this is a very different thing from saying, as Dr. Todd's representation would lead the uninitiated to suppose was the manner of Wycliffe, that the bread and wine become after the consecration, '*not only a sacrament, but the very body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ*,' that those substances become this '*sensibly*;' not only sacramentally, 'but in truth,' the bread being 'that *very body which is broken by the hands of the priest, and with the teeth of the faithful.*' If Wycliffe's ideas concerning the presence of Christ in the eucharist differed at all from those now generally entertained among protestants, it was in so slight a degree as scarcely to admit of being defined. It is certain, that when writing the fourth book of his Trialogus, he held no such doctrine on this subject as is expressed in the language imputed to him by Dr. Todd; and if this treatise could be ascribed to Wycliffe, it must have been written by him about the same time with the Trialogus.

But strong as this point may be, it is by no means the strongest opposed to the statement of Dr. Todd, that 'the treatise contains nothing inconsistent with the supposition that Wycliffe was the author.' The second chapter of the treatise is upon indulgences, and contains the following passage:—

'It seemeth well that popes, cardinals, and other prelates, priests, and other religious, may medefully and graciously sell indulgences and merits of saints, and prayers, and ghostly suffrages, as they may grant by Christian men swilk (such) things, or benefits and deeds of mercy and other goods; and thus may the other buy. And many may not take part of grace nor of bliss, but if they buy it in some manner, and it be sold them, it seemeth by this that Christ bought us again, and for our good deeds promises us heavenly kingdom; thus blessed martyrs for glorious martyrdoms deserved to have perpetual crowns. Thus the apostle did all things for the gospel, that he should be made pre-

* 'Corpus Christi est ibi spiritualiter, etiam modo quo distinguitur essentialiter a corpore panis.'

server thereof. Also thus say we, oh, marvellous merchandize, the Maker of mankind taking a solid body of the Virgin, deigned to be borne, and foregoing man without seed, may give us his godhead; such faith is ever made in hope, trust, and charity. And thus if the pope, or any other, any time faithfully and charitably grant and promise to any man *indulgence, or part of merit of saints, part of prayers, abstinence, wakings, obedience, or other deeds*, justly, and on God's pleasure, and graciously, for their good deeds, either that they be released of sins, or of pains, or that they be the more stirred to the faith, or to please God, *blessedly they sell* swilk (such) things to them. But if the pope, led by covetousness, or otherwise, as by simony, or with the spirit of pride, as if they herewith beginning disposed all things, and grant swilk (such) things to ilke man, yea, without merit, or without God leader before. . . . . who shall then doubt but that the pope and others sell such things sinfully ?'*

It will be seen that in this passage we have a full recognition of the popish bank of merit. The merits of martyrs and saints, their prayers, abstinence, vigils, obedience, and deeds, all are regarded as available as means of release from sins and pains in the case of those who need such assistance. This supposed accumulation of saint and martyr merit is to be dispensed virtuously and religiously, but it is supposed to exist, and the clergy are set forth as the proper almoners of this sort of bounty. Is this the doctrine of Wycliffe? We think not.

In the work 'On Prelates,' which was written by the Reformer, in common with the last book of the Trialogus, not more than two years before his death, he expresses himself as follows, on this subject:—'But the simony of the court of Rome does most harm, for it is most common, and done most under the colour of holiness, and robbeth most our land. When a lord hath the gold for his presentation, the gold dwelleth still in the land, but when the pope hath the first fruits, the gold goeth out, and cometh never again. *And so for pardons; if they are aught worthy they must be free, and to take money for them is to sell God's grace, and so simony.*'† In the thirteenth chapter of the same treatise, this doctrine is condemned still more explicitly. The clergy, it is said, are wont to promise pardon, 'by virtue of Christ's passion, and of the martyrdom and holy merits of saints, which they did more than was needful for their own bliss, *but this Christ taught never in all the gospel, and never used it, neither Peter nor Paul. Marvellous it is that any sinful fool dares grant anything on the merit of saints, for all that ever any saint did may not bring a soul to heaven without the grace and might of Christ's passion.*' In this alone, it is alleged, are 'all merits which are

* Pp. 10, 11. † MS., Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, chap. iv.

needful:' and the same doctrine occurs in many other places. This, it will be seen, is not quite the same thing with setting forth the popish doctrine concerning the supererogatory merit of saints as a truth, and then describing the indulgences drawn from the treasury of those merits as the matters of a legitimate spiritual 'merchandize,' which men, under certain regulations, may 'blessedly sell, and blessedly buy.'

But such was the doctrine of Wycliffe, and such is the doctrine of a treatise described by Dr. Todd as containing 'nothing inconsistent with the supposition that Wycliffe was its author'!

It may be alleged as some extenuation of this palpable error, that the evidence showing it to be such, is derived from manuscripts, and from manuscripts difficult to consult, and little known; and in the case of most men this plea might have been admitted. But in the case of Dr. Todd it is not admissible. Dr. Todd is much praised by some of his clerical friends, on account of the supposed accuracy and extent of his knowledge on this subject. They speak of him as more competent than any other man to the sort of work which he has undertaken in the publication of this treatise; and the manner in which Dr. Todd has taken upon himself the office of censor in regard to those who have ventured to meddle with such matters, has been such as to indicate sufficiently that he does not account the praise so bestowed as being ill-placed. The least that may be exacted from Dr. Todd is, that he should show himself to be very familiar with what is contained in the Wycliffe MSS. in Trinity College, Dublin. The manner in which Dr. Todd has written concerning those MSS., and the ease with which he may have consulted them at any time, during many years past, render it imperative to his reputation that he should not allow himself to be convicted of any material mistake concerning them. But in that collection are copies of all the more valuable of the Reformer's works, and among them a copy of the very treatise 'On Prelates,' from which the above extracts are taken. Our extracts were made from the copy in Cambridge, but we doubt not that the copy in Dublin will be found to contain them; and were the copy existing in Dublin imperfect, or wholly wanting, the remaining MSS. in that collection, contain matter, the smallest acquaintance with which should have sufficed to have saved Dr. Todd from so egregious an error as is that into which he has fallen on this point.

But we have now to add, that our proofs in respect to the unsoundness of Dr. Todd's pretensions with regard to a peculiarly accurate acquaintance with the writings of Wycliffe, are not derived wholly from manuscript sources. The fourth book of the Trialogus contains a noble summary of the reformer's

opinions; it includes evidence of being written within two years of his death; and his opponents, Wodeford, Walden, and the good fathers at the council of Constance, have taken care that we should not be left in any uncertainty as to whether the Trialogus should be accounted a genuine work of Wycliffe or not. Now this Trialogus is a printed book, a book which Dr. Todd cites, and which, in consequence, we must suppose him to be in circumstances to consult. We have had reason to complain of Dr. Todd as having made a very sorry use of this book when professing to state to his readers the doctrine of Wycliffe on the matter of the eucharist. But we have stronger ground of complaint in the present instance.

The fourth book of the Trialogus is divided, like the rest, into chapters, each chapter has its heading, and one of these headings is *De Indulgentiis*. It might have been supposed that the most superficial inquirer concerning matters of this sort, could hardly have observed the manner in which the doctrine of indulgences is set forth in the treatise now printed, without a very strong misgiving as to the propriety of attributing such a document to Wycliffe; and however natural it might be that obscure manuscripts, difficult to consult, should have been somewhat overlooked, the least to have been expected was, that the doctrine of the reformer on this subject, as stated in the printed and more accessible portions of his works, should have been carefully examined. But strange to say, in the present case, even this obvious source of information appears to have been wholly neglected. In the chapter of the Trialogus, *De Indulgentiis*, the reformer thus states the received doctrine on this subject:—'In the first place, they suppose that infinite supererogatory merits of saints are laid up in heaven, and especially the merit of the Lord Jesus Christ, enough for the salvation of infinite worlds, and that Christ has appointed the pope as chief over the whole of this treasure; and secondly, that what it pleases him to dispense from that source, he has power to distribute without limit, since the treasure remains infinite. Against this VULGAR BLASPHEMY I have often inveighed.'* He then proceeds to state, at length, on what ground he so judged this doctrine; partly because he regarded it as an assumption of power on the part of the pope, which Christ himself never assumed, either as man or God; partly, because if it were true, it would then be the fault of the pontiff if any

* 'Supponunt enim primo, quod in cœlis sint infinita sanctorum supererogata merita, et specialiter meritum domini nostri Jesu Christi, quod sufficeret salvare mundos alios infinitos, et super illum totum thesaurum Christus Papam constituit. Ad secundum quod sibi libuerit dispensandum, ideo infinitum potest de illo distribuere, cum hoc remaneat infinitum. Contra istam rudem blasphemiam invexi alias.'

portion of mankind should be lost, since the possession of a power to save after this manner, must imply an obligation to put it into exercise; and partly because such a scheme must overlook the fact, that it not only belongs to Christ to complete the righteousness which justifies the sinner, but to bestow upon the mind of the sinner all the grace and worthiness of which it can possibly be possessed.*

Such, then, are the grounds on which we conclude that this treatise is not from the pen of Wycliffe, and on which we are obliged to come to a conclusion little flattering to the notion of Dr. Todd's singular competency to the province of a judge in relation to such questions. It is somewhat unfortunate, that a gentleman, whose supposed capability to the work of editing Wycliffe MSS. has been so much applauded, should have made his appearance in that character under circumstances so little advantageous. This treatise, it seems, has been published, together with its companion at the head of this article, in order to show the weakness of supposing that anything certain can be known in respect to the opinions of Wycliffe, until Dr. Todd, or some one of equal ability in this department of labour, shall have given to the world a complete edition of the reformer's works. Of course, no doubt can now be entertained with regard to the propriety of at once committing the editorship of the whole of the Wycliffe MSS. to the literary integrity, the accurate learning, and the eminent critical sagacity of Dr. Todd.

With regard to the contents of this treatise, it will be sufficient to say that its chief value consists in its presenting, within the limits of a single document, all the leading points of the Lollard controversy, with the usual arguments in support of them. It alleges, as the topics of so many distinct chapters,—that the pope is not the vicar of Christ; that his holiness may not sell indulgences to souls in purgatory, or to the lost; that church censures should be only for spiritual ends, and are without effect if passed on the righteous man; that Christ was cursed; that the power of the keys belongs to every priest; that every priest is bound to preach; that men who accept the offices of an immoral priest, commit deadly sin; that to curse whom God has not cursed, is to bear false witness against our neighbour; that to choose the poverty of the religious, is to choose damnation; that fasting is

* 'Per deducens ad impossibile declaratur, quod si viator in tempore alicujus Papæ damnabitur, ipse Papæ erit reus damnationis, propter hoc quod obmittit ipsum salvare .... quod virtute passionis Christi homines *quicquid* beatitudinis habuerint mercantur .... Oportet enim Christum plus facere, tam ex parte sui pro complemento justitiæ, quam ex parte peccantis, quem oportet Christum movere, et dare sibi gratiam ad merendum digne, ut taliter sit adiutus.'

needful only as means of abstaining from sin; that a priest is not bound to canonical hours, except officially; that the substance of the bread dwelleth in the sacrament of the altar; that churches are not to be worshipped; that priests who sing by covenant for money, commit simony; that the pope, cardinals, bishops, &c., are disciples of Antichrist; that every holy man is the true vicar of Christ; that a judge condemning an innocent man, sinneth mortally; that marriage within certain degrees is lawful; that the church, by marrying within a prohibited degree sinneth; that the canon law is contrary to God's law; that no man is Christ's disciple unless he keep Christ's counsel; that each man is bound to do the better (to forego a lesser rule when required by a greater); that the written gospel is not to be worshipped; that the use of charms is unlawful; that the vow of the religious is against the gospel of Christ; that religious men are bound to bodily works; and that it is not lawful for the religious to beg. Such are the topics of thirty chapters; the arguments adduced in defence of them exhibit nothing of novelty, and our limits require that we should proceed to examine the next antiquarian fragment edited by Dr. Todd—'The Last Age of the Church.'

This tract occurs in a volume of tracts and treatises preserved in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, the greater part of which are undoubtedly Wycliffe's, and the whole of which, it is reasonable to suppose, were so regarded when the volume was transcribed, which appears to have been in the life-time of the reformer, or soon afterwards. The author of 'The Last Age of the Church,' speaks of the year 1356 as that in which the piece was written, a date many years earlier than can be assigned to any other work supposed to be from the pen of Wycliffe. Dr. Todd has justly remarked, that it is this circumstance alone which gives to the production its value. In itself it is little worthy of the reformer's reputation. It is a mystical exposition of church history, dividing it into four periods, the century in which the writer lived being regarded as a destined period of great tribulation, and the time following being that which would be marked by the coming of Antichrist. Hence the title of the tract.

Dr. Vaughan has given some account of this production, and extracts from it, which Dr. Todd has criticised in his favourite repository, the British Magazine, with his usual narrowness and ill-temper. Dr. Vaughan is censured because he has described the author of the tract as following the guidance of the abbot Joachim in his mystical interpretation of the times, but the printed tract shows that there was good reason for this representation; and comparing the tract with Mr. Lewis's description of it, as an attack on 'the covetous exactions of the popes,' and

with Dr. Vaughan's description of it, as relating 'to the general corruption of the ecclesiastical system, arising from simony and other causes,' we are disposed to regard the latter as, on the whole, a more just representation of its purport than the former. It makes no mention of the popes nor of Rome, nor does it contain any reference to them, except as it may be implied in the censure of general abuses which the papacy had sanctioned, and had its interest in upholding. Dr. Vaughan has further presumed to give his extracts from this almost unintelligible document, not strictly in the order in which they occur in the MS., and two or three words he is thought to have understood erroneously or doubtfully, but his censor is obliged to admit that the sense of the passages given remains undisturbed, and that points of the criticism in which he has indulged, relate to matters 'of no great consequence.'* We wish also distinctly to state, in this place, that Dr. Todd's notices of Dr. Vaughan's account of this tract, futile and frivolous as they are, may be taken as a favourable specimen of his critical labours in regard to the account which Dr. Vaughan has given of the Wycliffe MSS. generally, in his 'Life and Opinions' of the reformer. On the whole, Dr. Todd has done nothing towards showing that this tract was written by Wycliffe, nor has he thrown any material light upon it in other respects. It is, in common with the Lollard treatise, an interesting publication, but its interest arises from its full and accurate text, and not from anything particularly instructive in the notes of the editor. It must be felt, we think, as a somewhat unpromising affair, that of two manuscripts, published for the purpose of showing what might be accomplished by employing such men as Dr. Todd in editing the writings of Wycliffe, the one should add nothing really valuable to the amount of our previous knowledge, and the other be given to the world in a manner adapted to lead men into much greater mistakes with regard to the doctrine and character of the reformer than they were likely otherwise to have adopted. Unless the stars should be more propitious to Dr. Todd in his next experiment in this way, we doubt much if his labours will prove to be very productive.

But our great complaint against Dr. Todd does not relate to his want of critical discernment, and still less to his want of a certain kind of ecclesiastical learning, though in both these respects he has been foolishly overrated, but to his contracted and ungenerous temper—a temper which has been so far indulged as to have betrayed him into practices singularly at variance with a proper sense of justice, and a just reverence of truth. Enough has appeared in this article to show that we have not formed this

* British Magazine, viii., 207, 272, 402, 406.

opinion lightly; but its accuracy will be further manifest from what follows. The following passage is from Dr. Todd's preface to 'The Last Age of the Church:'—

'The list of Wycliffe's writings published by Bishop Bale, in his work, *Scriptorum Majoris Brytanniæ Catalogus*, has been necessarily made the basis of all that subsequent writers have collected. It has been reprinted with many useful additions, by the learned and indefatigable John Lewis, of whose labours every student must speak with gratitude. Mr. Baber also has done much towards assisting future inquirers, by the very valuable list of the reformer's writings which he has compiled. Here, however, we must stop; Mr. Vaughan's compilation has not added much to our knowledge of the subject, nor can it be commended either for accuracy or learning; and Mr. Le Bas does not profess to do more than follow his predecessors. His humble task, however, has been executed with great elegance and judgment.'

With this characteristic report from Dr. Todd, as to the comparative merit of his predecessors in the labour of endeavouring to make the public acquainted with the writings of Wycliffe, we shall connect another report, on the same subject, from a scholar on the continent. The preface to the 'Treatise on the Life, Character, and Writings of Wycliffe,' placed at the head of this article, reads as follows:—

'Seeing that Wycliffe had great weight and influence, both with the men of his own time, and with posterity, and that the age which produced him is most memorable in English history, I have resolved in the following discourse to investigate his character, the times in which he lived, the works he produced, and what kind of ecclesiastical reformation he had in view. In order, however, that the most important facts might become more obvious, I have detailed a few of those events which took place prior to his lifetime, and have treated of those efforts to effect a reformation of the church which were made on the Continent before his day. As Wycliffe was, without doubt, opposed to the errors of the church, not carried away by a sort of overheated zeal, but under the influence of a matured and rational judgment, and appears to have wished to proceed step by step in its reformation, it is from a consideration of these steps that the division of my subject has arisen. Having thus investigated his life, character, and principal doctrines, I have then spoken at some length of his chief works, and in conclusion summed up the substance of the whole treatise, so as to make evident the opinion which ought to be formed in regard to the objects and labours of Wycliffe.

'As to my authorities, I have availed myself as well of the works of those who were the enemies of Wycliffe as of those authors who held him in highest estimation. Accordingly, I have made especial use of the histories of Henry Knyghton and Thomas Walsingham, the former of whom flourished in the time of Wycliffe, the latter in the

following century. I have consulted beyond these many records of councils, and public enactments, and the works of Bale, Fox, Harpsfield, Wood, Wharton, and others who have written about Wycliffe.* Though I saw that his character and doctrines were to be best elucidated from his own writings, I had no opportunity of examining his MSS., which are preserved in great numbers to this day, when those English writers who have immortalized their countryman, assisted me, and held out an admirable light for my guidance. For what had been commenced by Thomas James in his 'Apology for John Wiclif,' published in the year 1608, and by John Lewis, in his book intitled, 'The History of the Life and Sufferings of John Wicliff, D.D.' London. 1720, has been carried out with much more accuracy, fullness, and labour in our own time by Mr. Robert Vaughan, in his work intitled 'The Life and Opinions of John de Wycliffe, D.D.,' London, second edition, 1831, who has illustrated the life, character, and doctrines of the reformer, with extraordinary success, from the Wycliffe MSS. Principally guided by this work, Mr. Le Bas soon afterwards wrote a shorter life of Wycliffe, adapted not only for the learned, but also for ordinary readers—The Life of John Wiclif, London, 1832. Beside these works, I was enabled to avail myself of Baber's preface to Wiclif's version of the New Testament, which he published in 1810, and of a little work containing certain parts of Wycliffe's MSS. which has lately been published by a religious society in London. So much then for the matter, plan, and authorities of my treatise.'

This book presents, as the above extract will have suggested, a judicious and valuable account of the life, opinions, and writings of the reformer. It is an octavo volume, written in elegant latin; it is based on a scrupulous examination of all printed sources of information on the subject, continental and English, from the earliest to the latest; it is written by a scholar, in the language of scholars, and is meant to have its place in the libraries of the learned in Europe and through the world. Dr. Groneman, in common with Mr. Le Bas, was fully acquainted with all that had been published on this subject before the appearance of Dr. Vaughan's book, and both avow their pleasure, in being able to avail themselves of that work as their principal guide. They concur, accordingly, in giving a marked precedence, in value, to

* 'Nobis autem, ex ipsius viri scriptis ingenium ejus et placita præsertim esse explananda intelligentibus, neque libros ejus MSS., qui magno adhuc asservantur numero, inspiciendi copiâ factâ, succerrerunt et facem egregie prætulerunt auctores illi Anglici, qui popularis sui memoriam immortalitati commendarunt. Quod enim antea maxime Thomas Jamesius, in Apologiâ, quam scripsit 1608 pro. Joh. Wicliffo, et Johannes Lewisius, in libro: the Hist. of the Life, and Sufferings of John Wicliffe, D.D., Lond. 1720, incepe-rant, hoc nostra ætate multo accuratius uberiusque elaboratum est a Roberto Vaughano, in opere: The Life and Opinions of John Wycliffe, D.D. Lond. Ed. 2, 1831, qui e libris Wicliffi MSS., cum vitam ejus et ingenium, tum doctrinam, eximie illustravit.'

the publication in which Dr. Todd would not appear to be capable of recognising the slightest degree of merit. Dr. Todd will perhaps answer,—it may be so, but those authors have not given the attention to the Wycliffe MSS. that I have done, or they would think differently. We would, however, respectfully suggest that it will become Dr. Todd to express himself more cautiously on matters of this nature than has been his wont. We know that he has nibbled and fretted on this subject, through paper after paper in the British Magazine, but that anything really valuable has been discovered by him as the result of his studies among Wycliffe MSS. we have still to learn. *To no fact in the reformer's history, to no article of his creed, has Dr. Todd been able to bring the smallest degree of light.* When disposed to appear very authoritative on this subject, we would beseech him to bear in mind, that the blundering which disfigures the editorship of this Lollard Treatise, is not likely to be forgotten; and to remember also, that the world is not made up of the British Magazine, and that there may accordingly be people in it perverse enough to regard him as a person more likely to lead the way upon a false scent on questions of this nature, than upon a true one.

We are willing to suppose that the term 'compilation' in the above extract, is used by Dr. Todd with reference to the compiled list of the reformer's writings at the end of Dr. Vaughan's work, and not with a reference to the work itself. The term, however, is so employed, that almost every one on reading it will understand it in the latter and larger sense—a sense in which the expression would be iniquitously unjust. We know of no work in the recent history of our literature which has afforded greater proof of being the result of original and laborious research than 'The Life and Opinions of Wycliffe.' Thus much its author might himself freely assert concerning it, since it would merely be to claim, in his own behalf, that very moderate degree of praise which is considered due to the humble merit of industry.

But the policy of Dr. Todd has been, to understand Dr. Vaughan as claiming to have published a book which left not the smallest thing to be supplied concerning the writings of Wycliffe; and on this assumption, our divine has given himself to the study of the Wycliffe MSS. in Dublin, in hope of finding something in Dr. Vaughan's account of those MSS. which might be accounted as an inaccuracy, or something which might be made to appear as a defect, and then, upon such real or imaginary instances, it has been his pleasure to employ himself in founding and iterating the charge of unsound and unauthorized pretension. But did Dr. Vaughan send forth his work as one in which no sort of mistake might be detected, or as one on which no im-

provement might be made? No. His claim simply was, that of having brought to his labour, as a biographer of Wycliffe, a mind more adequately instructed with regard to the writings of the reformer than any of his predecessors; and a mind sufficiently informed in that respect to justify him in the persuasion, that no future investigation would be found materially to disturb the report which he had made concerning the life and opinions of that extraordinary man. Now it is not only true that Dr. Todd has done nothing toward showing that this confidence was ill placed, but we venture to assert that it will not be within his power, nor within the power of any coadjutorship which he may obtain, to present the character of Wycliffe in any other light than that in which it is already presented, nor to show that the opinions attributed to the great reformer have been in any material respect incorrectly attributed to him.* The Wycliffe MSS. in Dublin are between sixty and seventy in number; they include transcripts of all the more valuable of the reformer's writings; Dr. Todd has been in the habit of very frequently consulting them for many years past; and this attention has been given to them for the manifest purpose of eliciting from them, if possible, some new light, such especially as might suffice to depreciate the labours of Dr. Vaughan; and what is the effect? We repeat, just nothing. In short, let any man of discernment read the forty-four chapters which constitute the last book of the Trialogus, relating as they do throughout to the distinctive opinions of the reformer, and expressing those opinions as they do in the matured period of the reformer's life, and it must be plain, that so far as the substance of Wycliffe's opinions is concerned, mankind are already in possession of their knowledge. Dr. Todd may gravely assure us that we shall not be in a condition to form any certain judgment on that subject, until labour like his own shall have been expended in editing a complete collection of the reformer's writings; and Dr. Todd may flatter himself that in putting forth such language he is giving evidence of his learning, and of his critical dis-

* Only one attempt, we believe, has been made by Dr. Todd to convict Dr. Vaughan of inaccuracy in his description of Wycliffe's opinions, and that is in the first paper which appeared on this subject in the British Magazine. Dr. Vaughan has described Wycliffe as teaching that the people were not obliged to pay tithes to unworthy ministers. Dr. Todd alleges that in the passages cited, the reformer merely meant to say that the people in such case would be *less* guilty than the ministers, and not that any fault would justify the withholding of tithes from ministers. But strange enough, the doctrine of one of the chapters of this Lollard treatise is, that to accept of the offices of an immoral priest, is to commit deadly sin; so that, according to Dr. Todd, Wycliffe would account it a deadly sin to accept the offices of an immoral priest, and at the same time count it a very proper thing to pay tithes to such priests for the performance of such offices! We feel assured that Wycliffe was more mindful of the consistent in such matters, than is the manner of Dr. Todd.

cernment and caution, but to men who know what this ground is fully as well, or very much better than Dr. Todd, his conduct will appear in no other light than as a somewhat amusing display of feebleness and arrogance. No other man, we presume, has examined the Wycliffe MSS. in Dublin so largely as Dr. Todd; but the equally authentic MSS. of the same works, as existing in England, have been so examined, so analyzed, and so far printed, or reported upon from the press, and the dates, moreover, of so large a proportion of them, have been so distinctly ascertained from internal evidence, that no editorship on this subject can be expected to add anything considerable to our knowledge, though much might no doubt be supplied as affording a wider, and, in some respects, a more satisfactory range of illustration.

But it must not be forgotten, that the genius of antiquarianism has to do with more important and difficult matters than with the history of orthography, with the precise form or power of obsolete letters, or with the kind of illumination proper to ancient manuscripts, or to early specimens of printing. Concerning things of this nature, the 'mint and cummin' of antiquarianism, Dr. Todd is very studious. But the 'weightier matters,' the acute and comprehensive intellect, which can separate between real evidence and false appearances, however blended together; and the moral qualities, which concede readily and heartily to a precursor in labour his due, being intent only upon truth—in these things the vice-president of the Irish Antiquarian Society is lamentably wanting.

Extended as this article has become, there is one more exhibition of the kind of infirmity we have imputed to Dr. Todd to which we must call the attention of our readers. Dr. Vaughan, in a note to one of the chapters in his Congregationalism, referred to a statement in one of the papers of Dr. Todd, as containing, in his judgment, a gross misrepresentation. On seeing this note, Dr. Todd sent an angry sort of reply to the pages of the British Magazine. To that communication Dr. Vaughan sent an answer, which appeared in the next number of that publication, and from which we select the following passage:—

'Sir,—A friend has called my attention to a paper in your last number from Dr. Todd relating to myself, on which I must beg permission to offer a word or two of explanation.

'The heading given to my catalogue of the Wycliffe MSS. is as follows:—

"Section II. *Including the Wycliffe MSS. extant in England and Ireland. This series contains nearly forty MSS., preserved in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, the existence of which has been hitherto unknown to the reformer's biographers.*'

'To this statement Dr. Todd now objects—

'I. That allowing its meaning to be, that my series of the reformer's MSS. contains mention of nearly forty duplicate or additional manuscripts, of which no mention had been made by any preceding biographer, the statement in this sense is not correct, the manuscripts so mentioned by me being found upon examination to be not more than half that number.

'The Nos. admitted by Dr. Todd as so mentioned by me are, No. 1, and Nos. 3 to 19, inclusive, with the exception of No. 6, making together seventeen; but we still count them as eighteen, as No. 19 contains two distinct treatises, enumerated as such by Mr. Lewis. The other Nos. admitted by Dr. Todd as belonging to this series are, Nos. 28, 30, 34, and 44, which brings my series to twenty-two. Then comes No. 47, under which are classed three volumes of manuscripts, each volume consisting of a number of distinct treatises or tracts, enumerated and described by me in the following manner:—

'' 47. In a volume preserved in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, is a series of treatises described as follows:—Class C, Tab. 1, No. 23.

'' 1. *Tractatus Evangelii de Sermone Domini in Monte, cum Expositorio Orationis Dominicæ. Dividitur in tres Libros.*

'' 2. *Tractatus de Antichristo, cum Expositorio in* xxiii., xxiv., xxv., *cap. Matthæi.*

'' 3. *Tractatus in Sermonem Domini, quem facerat valedicendo Discipulis suis.*

'' 4. *Tractatus de Statu Innocentiæ.*

'' 5. *Tractatus de Tempore, in* 13 *capitulis.*

'' 6. *Expositio quorundum locorum Scripturæ.* Titus, ii. cap. Heb. i. cap. et Isaiæ, xxv. cap. But these are merely parts of his homilies. The volume extends to 400 pages, and, which is peculiar to this collection of Wycliffe MSS., it has a copious index.

'' Class C, Tab. I., No. 24.—1. *De Simonia.* 2. *De Apostasia.* 3. *De Blasphemia.* The first piece extends to about forty small folio pages, the second to about half that number; the last consists of about eight pages.

'' Another volume in the same library contains a MS. entitled, '*Of Apostacy, and Possessions of Clerks.*' This volume further contains the following tracts:—*Of Pseudo Friars; Of the Eight Woes God wished to Friars; Of Antichrist and his ways; Of Antichrist's Song in the Church: A Treatise of Prayer; A Treatise on Confession; A Tract of Christian Obedience*, beginning, 'Christ forsooth did all that he could to obey lords.' In this volume there are several separate homilies, meditations on various subjects, a short treatise, beginning—'How are questions and answers put that are written hereafter?' The collection forms a duodecimo volume of about 400 pages, written with a very small but legible character.—Class C, Tab. V., No. 6.'*

* Life and Opinions of Wycliffe, vol. ii. pp. 391, 392, second edition.

'In this account it will be perceived that there are at least eighteen distinct MSS. described, which makes my series at least forty. Of this number it is admitted that not more than four are mentioned by Mr. Lewis, leaving 'nearly forty' to constitute the series which are mentioned by me as existing in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, but which had not been so mentioned by any preceding biographer.

'Now it will be in vain for Dr. Todd to plead that these manuscripts are some of them short, inasmuch as a large portion of them are quite of the average length of Wycliffe's treatises; and inasmuch, also, as he has himself described Nos. 26 and 29 as in the proper sense MSS., and has given Mr. Lewis credit for referring to them as such, though the first does not contain more than four pages, and the second does not exceed two. It will be observed, also, that the nearly twenty MSS. which are classed and described by me under No. 47, are not even bound in one volume, but in three. And it will now be still further observed, that in order to reduce my alleged series of 'nearly forty' MSS. to somewhat less than twenty, Dr. Todd has counted these several volumes, each including a series of treatises or tracts, as ONE Wycliffe manuscript! Let this suffice concerning Dr. Todd's *new* ground of impeachment against me.

'II. But admitting for a moment that the matter is, in this respect, as I have shewn it to be, Dr. Todd represents me as saying, that the very *existence* of those nearly forty MSS. had been hitherto unknown to the reformer's biographers, and this he insists is not true as regards Mr. Lewis.

'Now on what evidence does Dr. Todd found his conclusion in favour of Mr. Lewis's knowledge in this particular?

'In part on the fact that the following four lines on this subject appear in Mr. Lewis's preface: 'What account I have had of the MSS. in Ireland, I thankfully acknowledge to have received it from the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Kilmore, and the Rev. Dr. Howard, Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin.' Dr. Todd supposes that the '*What* account,' &c., thus acknowledged, must be understood to mean a full account, such an account as would enable Mr. Lewis to 'mention and describe' every article of Wycliffe MS. in that library. It will be admitted, perhaps, that this was rather a slight form of acknowledgment for services necessarily involving so much labour, and coming from such quarters. It is a very rare thing, as those who have tried it know, for assistance of that nature to be obtained on so large a scale.

'But Dr. Todd will no doubt say that it is not on this circumstance alone that his conclusion is grounded. It is proper, however, that I should remind him, that the manner in which he has spoken of the information so obtained by Mr. Lewis is to the above effect. But there was, it seems, a catalogue of the MSS. in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, printed at Oxford in 1697; and this catalogue, it is supposed, as a matter of course, Mr. Lewis must have seen. It is now twice seven years since my attention was occupied with this subject. At that time, the only catalogue of the MSS. in Trinity College,

Dublin, I found known to Dr. Sadlier, the librarian, or to more than one of the fellows with whom I had conversation, was a volume of MS. catalogue which lay on the library table; and in my subsequent correspondence with Dr. Singer—a senior fellow of the college, and a gentleman of whose liberality and kindness I hope ever to retain a grateful remembrance—reference was more than once made to a person in Dublin, who was employed in preparing that desideratum for the manuscript library—a printed catalogue. Was it unnatural, in such circumstances, that I should have been without suspicion as to the existence of such a catalogue? And informed as I now am that such a book exists, and has existed since 1697, my conviction is unhesitating, that it was never seen nor heard of by Mr. Lewis.

'Had Mr. Lewis been fully apprised by Bishop Godwin, or Dr. Howard, concerning the number and description of the Wycliffe MSS. in Dublin, or had he seen the catalogue to which Dr. Todd refers, the proof of the knowledge thus obtained would surely have presented itself in his catalogue, drawn up as that is, on the plan of giving the fullest information in his power, not only with regard to the *works* of Wycliffe, but with regard to the number of existing Wycliffe MSS. Why describe the two or three MSS. which exist in Dublin, and which exist also elsewhere, as so existing, and not describe the 'nearly forty' beside which might have been so described? Why mention a tenth portion of these MSS., and leave the nine-tenths unmentioned; and why, especially, do so, when his plan required that whatever knowledge of this kind he possessed should be put forth?

'The sum is this. Two friends communicate to Mr. Lewis some account of the MSS. in Dublin; and in 1697 a catalogue of those MSS. was printed in England. On the ground of these facts, Dr. Todd informs us, that he 'happened to *know*' that the 'existence,' at least of the nearly forty MSS. mentioned by me, must have been known to my predecessor, Mr. Lewis. Dr. Todd has not the slightest degree of proof that the persons who gave Mr. Lewis an account of the four MSS. he does mention, gave him an account also of the 'nearly forty' which he does not mention; nor has he any proof that Mr. Lewis ever saw the catalogue printed in 1697. While opposed to this want of evidence in favour of his being thus informed, on the one side, is the existence of something amounting to proof on the other side, in the non-appearance of such information in that chapter of Mr. Lewis's book where his plan required that it should appear, had it been in his possession.

'When a writer shews that he can make his way to a conclusion, not merely *without* evidence, but *against* it, there must be something wrong somewhere. It is true, by being thus credulous in favour of the knowledge of Mr. Lewis, Dr. Todd seizes upon ground on which to make charges very unfavourable to the knowledge, and even to the integrity, of Dr. Vaughan. Of course, we must not suppose that this has been the *motive* to such credulity.

'We now come to Dr. Todd's original misconstruction of the heading to my catalogue of the Wycliffe MSS.—viz.,

'III. That of describing me as meaning to say, that my catalogue contains nearly forty newly-discovered *works* of the reformer, and not merely that number of *duplicate* or *additional manuscripts*.

'My language is, that my catalogue 'contains nearly forty MSS. preserved in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, the existence of which has been hitherto unknown to the reformer's biographers.'

'Now can any of your readers need to be reminded, that the history of ancient MSS. is the history of so many separate transcripts, and that the transcript of a work does not cease to be valuable because it is not the only transcript of that work known to exist?

'Again—need I remind your readers, that the fact that Mr. Lewis has 'mentioned and described' certain works of the reformer from transcripts of them, to which he had access, as existing in England, is in itself no evidence of his being acquainted with certain transcripts of those same works as existing in Ireland? Or can it be necessary to caution any man against supposing that the fact that Mr. Lewis has 'made use' of a certain series of MSS. in England, is not, as a matter of fact, really the same thing with his having made use of another series of MSS. of the same description in another kingdom?

'But Dr. Todd, it seems, has been incapable of perceiving any one of these distinctions. He has been at great pains, it seems, to look intelligently and impartially at this matter, and, after all, he 'could not help' using an ambiguity of expression, which serves to confound all distinction between the *works* of Wycliffe, and the scattered transcripts of those works; nor could he help seeing in the fact that Mr. Lewis knew and used certain MSS. in England, the evidence that he must have known and have used certain other MSS. of the same description not in England. And then, as the consequence of his inability to see otherwise on these points, Dr. Todd 'could not help' charging me with having put on record a deliberate falsehood—a falsehood which would have been as remarkable for its stupidity as its baseness, since it would have been of that broad and obvious description that could not possibly escape detection and exposure!

'By this time, perhaps, some of your readers may begin to perceive that there may possibly be other reasons beside such as have respect to the learning or the sagacity of Dr. Todd, which may indispose a man to be much concerned with him as a controvertist.'

Dr. Todd, in the warmth of his indignation, had challenged Dr. Vaughan to a reply. The editor of the British Magazine, in consequence, could hardly have refused admission to the above paper; but we were a little curious to see how Dr. Todd would attempt to extricate himself from the unenviable position in which this paper had placed him. When a man stands convicted of delinquencies of this nature, there are two methods of proceeding open to him—a frank confession of his errors, or an attempt to get up the show of a reply, great care being taken, while so doing, to evade the main points of the accusation, and to indulge in disputatious talk about small matters, little, if at all, affecting those points, imposing upon the superficial, by putting forth the sem-

blance of a reply in place of the reality. The latter course is that chosen by Dr. Todd.

The first charge against Dr. Todd is, that in order to reduce the 'nearly forty MSS.,' mentioned by Dr. Vaughan as existing in Dublin, to not more than half that number, Dr. Todd had counted three volumes of MSS., each volume containing a series of tracts or treatises, as one Wycliffe manuscript. The whole of Dr. Todd's reply to this charge is in the following passage:—

'Dr. Vaughan now replies, that by the term 'MSS.' he intended not separate volumes, but tracts or pieces, of which several are generally to be found in the same volume; and, in this way, including some tracts which, although separately enumerated, are, in reality, only chapters or sections of one and the same treatise, Dr. Vaughan has succeeded in showing that he had mentioned about thirty-two MSS., a number which he thinks may be taken as 'nearly forty,' though other people might imagine it nearer to thirty MSS.'

In this short passage there are nearly as many incorrect statements, either direct or virtual, as there are lines. In the first place, it is not, as the above extract insinuates, *one* volume, consisting of a series of treatises or tracts, which Dr. Todd has described as one manuscript, but they are three volumes, which have been so described by him—described, not even as counting for three manuscripts, but as counting for one only! In the second place, it was not reasonable, as Dr. Todd further insinuates, that he should have understood Dr. Vaughan as meaning to say that he had made mention of nearly forty 'volumes' of manuscripts not mentioned by his predecessors; on the contrary, Dr. Todd must have known such a supposition to be so utterly absurd, that he could not but have known that Dr. Vaughan did not so mean, even while affecting to suppose that such was his meaning. In the third place, it was not, as Dr. Todd alleges, a natural thing in him to reckon the Wycliffe MSS. adverted to by the volume, and not according to the treatises or tracts which the volume might include, inasmuch as Bale, Lewis, Baber, every one who has written concerning those MSS., all have described them piece by piece, whether long or short, and each by its title or beginning, and inasmuch as Dr. Todd himself has pursued this course on all occasions, excepting in this one instance, in which, as we have seen, he had a particular reason for departing from his own practice in this respect, and from that of every one else. In the fourth place, the pieces enumerated by Dr. Vaughan, allowing the mode of enumeration ascribed to him by Dr. Todd to have been adopted, amount to thirty-six, and not to thirty-two only. In the fifth-place, Dr. Vaughan has not counted parts of treatises as being separate works, in any instance that we find, unless it be in the case of the pieces—*De Apostasia, De Simonia, De Blasphemia,* which Dr. Todd alleges are parts of the work intitled

De Veritate Scripturæ; but Dr. Todd is the first person who has so described these pieces, and as Dr. Todd confesses his inability to decipher even the chapters of contents to the volume in which these pieces are found, we must confess that we have no such faith in his general accuracy on such matters as to account his solitary testimony on this point of any great value.

On the whole, we think our readers will perceive that it is not often that so narrow a space as that presented in the above extract is found to include so large an amount of error; and that this pretended defence, while leaving the original accusation wholly untouched, exhibits only a further display of the mental or moral infirmity which it was meant to conceal.

The next charge against Dr. Todd relates to the assertion that to his 'knowledge,' Mr. Lewis was acquainted with the existence of the 'nearly forty MSS.' mentioned by Dr. Vaughan, and that he has 'used, mentioned, and described' every one of them; and Dr. Vaughan, adducing evidence to the contrary of this assertion, challenges Dr. Todd to show the ground on which he persists in ascribing such knowledge to Mr. Lewis. The whole of Dr. Todd's reply to this challenge is in the following curious passage:

'I had shown that Dr. Vaughan's boast of having included in his catalogue 'forty MSS. preserved in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, the existence of which had been hitherto unknown to the reformer's biographers,' must be reduced at least one-half, even after allowing what he tells us 'every ingenuous man might have seen at a glance,' that the word 'unknown' in the above-quoted announcement meant only 'not particularly mentioned by,' and that 'the reformer's biographers' meant specially Mr. Lewis.''

Dr. Todd, it seems, had 'shown' that Dr. Vaughan's 'nearly forty' MSS. should be reduced below twenty. Our readers have seen *how* it is that Dr. Todd has so done, and will no doubt admire the taste which could descend to repeat such an assertion, after such exposure of the dealing on which it had been founded. But the most amusing part of this paragraph, is that in which Dr. Todd asserts that in speaking of the knowledge possessed on this subject by the 'reformer's biographers' he did not mean 'specially' Mr. Lewis; and that by the knowledge attributed to them, he has not meant, in the case of Mr. Lewis or of others, a knowledge indicated in a 'particular mention' of the said MSS. Now in the name of everything ingenuous, let the following passage be read attentively, it is Dr. Todd's, italics and all :—

'I set myself to compare Mr. Vaughan's list with that of Mr. Lewis, for the purpose of ascertaining what the newly-discovered MSS. were, and, notwithstanding my previous suspicion, I confess I was surprised to find *that it did not contain a single article which was not already mentioned and described by Mr. Lewis.*'

We must leave our readers to judge whether this reference to Mr. Lewis, as one of the reformer's biographers, be, or be not, 'special;' and we must leave them also to judge whether the knowledge on this point attributed to Mr. Lewis, be, or be not, a knowledge said to be indicated by a 'particular mention' of the MSS. in question. Driven from the above assertions in favour of the knowledge of Mr. Lewis in 'special,' Dr. Todd would now take refuge among the 'reformer's biographers' in general; but since Mr. Lewis must be supposed to have known at least as much on this subject as his predecessors, we are obliged to suspect that our critic will find this move, in common with every other he has taken, a move, according to the old adage, from bad to worse.

Concerning the original misrepresentation on this point, that of describing Dr. Vaughan as claiming to have called the public attention to nearly forty new *works* of the reformer's, while he merely spoke of having so done in respect to that number of new *manuscripts*, Dr. Todd has nothing to reply, except that he thinks nine persons out of ten would so understand the language of Dr. Vaughan! This is in effect to say, that duplicate manuscripts of works existing only in manuscript, are things the existence of which it is so difficult to suppose, that Dr. Vaughan ought to be understood as saying he has found, what he does not say he has found—viz., so many new *works* of the reformer, and not what he does say he has found—viz., so many new *manuscripts!* Could we think Dr. Todd so obtuse as really to believe this, we should have left his imbecility to the range of its own necessary harmlessness.

There is still one other point in this unique sort of defence deserving attention:—

'Dr. Vaughan now admits,' says Dr. Todd, 'that he was, and is, except from my statement, ignorant of the existence of the 'Catalogus Librorum Manuscriptorum Angliæ et Hiberniæ,' published in Oxford in 1697; and because he and two gentlemen whom he consulted (neither of whom have ever been known to have turned their attention to the subject) were ignorant of the existence of this book, he concludes that Mr. Lewis must have been ignorant of it too!

'Surely this is a little too bad. But if Dr. Vaughan now, after having published a life of Wycliffe, admits publicly his ignorance of so well known a book, to which one should have thought he would have had recourse in the first instance, in order to ascertain what MSS. of his author were in existence, he cannot complain if doubts are expressed of his qualifications for the task which he was bold enough to undertake.'

This passage, when examined, will be found to be in beautiful keeping with the rest. Pray from whom was Dr. Vaughan

likely to obtain information as to the existence of a printed catalogue of the MSS. in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin, if not from its resident fellows, to whose special keeping the manuscript library is intrusted, so that no man can copy or read a line in it without one of those gentlemen being present? From whom was this information likely to be obtained, if not from Dr. Sadlier, the librarian, a gentleman who, from his years, his tastes, and his office, was likely to be much better informed on this subject than any other man to whom application could be made? The insinuation, then, that Dr. Vaughan did not look to the best source for information is not honest; he looked to that source, and it failed him. But on the matter of this printed catalogue, a letter has been addressed by Dr. Vaughan to the Editor of the 'British Magazine,' which we shall insert in this place, as affording a further display of Dr. Todd's ingenuousness:—

'Sir,—It was not until a day or two since that I had given sufficient attention to Dr. Todd's recent communications in your pages concerning myself, to perceive that in the matter of the supposed printed catalogue of the Wycliffe MSS., in Trinity College, Dublin, I had committed an oversight, and one of which undue advantage has been taken.

'Dr. Todd describes the book to which he refers as a catalogue 'of all,' and 'of the whole,' of the MSS. in Trinity College, Dublin. Being satisfied that no such printed catalogue in respect to the Wycliffe MSS. in that collection had ever come under my notice, I at once confessed my ignorance as to its existence. On recurring to the subject, however, I find that the catalogue intended, so far from being unknown to me, is one which came under my examination in the Bodleian Library nearly twenty years since; and this fact would have occurred to me immediately, had not Dr. Todd's description of that publication been such as to create a totally false impression on my mind in respect to it.

'My papers relating to the Wycliffe MSS. in Trinity College, Dublin, taken at the time of examining those documents, contain a list of more than sixty MSS., the several small pieces included in the 'Pore Caitif' being counted together as one. In the printed catalogue to which reference has been made with so much confidence, the following are the whole of the insertions that occur in relation to the MSS. of Wycliffe.

'129. Tracts of John Wycliffe, 8vo. 148. Determinatio Jo. Wicliff, 1379. 401. Excerpta ex Jo. Wickliffe de Veritate Scripturæ. An exposition on Psalm cxliii. 4to, F. 42. 758. M. J. W. Tractatus de Veritate Scripturæ, Simonia, Apostasia, Blasphemia, fol., membr. c. 3. 812. (Pore Caitif) Discourses of Jo. Wicliffe touching the Ten Commandments: the P. N. of Perfect Life, Ghostly Battle, to Love of Jesus, of Contemplative Life, and of Chastitie. In old English, 8vo, parchment. H. 75. 813. Jo. Wickliffe's Postills, in old English,

fol. parchment, c. 35. 814. Jo. Wicliffe's Works to the Duke of Lancaster in 1368, 4to, parchment, H. 17.'

'Here we find eight insertions, or, at the most, eleven, in place of between sixty and seventy. In the case of seven of these insertions, there are only five so descriptive as to enable any man to discern the sort of MSS. intended. These seven insertions, it is probable, Mr. Lewis read, but the insertion numbered 758, he does not appear to have seen, and I think I can perceive the cause of his not having seen it. The other articles are all referred to in the Index, under the name 'Wiclif,' and the name of the author is printed in each instance in full; but No. 758 is not so pointed out, and in the place, the initials only of the name are given. It was my error to do nearly twenty years since, as my predecessor appears to have done a century before —viz., to rely on a treacherous index. It was not until I had examined the MSS. in Dublin, that I became aware of the pitiable deficiencies, in this respect, of this much boasted catalogue.

'Now Dr. Todd appeals to the fact that this catalogue was printed in 1697; he next assumes that Mr. Lewis must have seen it; and supposing Mr. Lewis to have seen it, Dr. Todd then proceeds to deride the notion of there being any Wycliffe MSS. in Dublin with the 'existence' of which, at least, that writer was not acquainted. Who would not conclude from Dr. Todd's manner of expressing himself on this matter that the said catalogue would be found to contain a list of the Reformer's MSS. hardly less specific, as to number and sort, than Dr. Todd himself might have supplied? But strange to say, on examination, the sum of the matter proves to be, that a catalogue consisting of eleven articles has been proclaimed as sufficient to have enabled Mr. Lewis to 'mention and describe' articles to some six times that amount! May I not ask, Sir, in the language of Dr. Todd, if this be not 'a little too bad'? But thus much concerning what Mr. Lewis might have learnt from this printed catalogue concerning the Wycliffe MSS. in Dublin; will Dr. Todd so far gratify your readers as to show—show on the ground of proper evidence and proof—to what *extent* Mr. Lewis found the Bishop of Kilmore and Dr. Howard more communicative than this printed catalogue?'

Such, then, are the notions of the honourable which Dr. Todd has brought with him to his labours as a critic. He repudiates the thought of being hostile to Dr. Vaughan on the ground of his being a dissenter; but however he may deceive others, or deceive himself by such a protest, we are not to be deceived by it. It is less disreputable to Dr. Todd to suppose that he has been prompted to these courses by his haughty feeling as a churchman, than to suppose that he has descended to this tissue of crooked practices from the pure love of indulging in them. Dr. Todd is one of a class. It is as such that we have dealt with him. It is on this account that we would urge our readers to mark the elements of his character, and to remember

them. Pride, egotism, and intolerance, are the impulses which govern these men, and between churchmen of this class, and British Congregationalists, many a hot war must be expected to ensue. We shrink not from the collision. We covet rather than fear it. We are disposed to do its proper homage to real piety wherever we find it, and we know how to estimate at its proper value the honourable and the generous in the man of the world; but the religion which only serves to make its possessor a bigot, and which, as the consequence, tends to vitiate all the natural sentiments of the heart, in place of improving them, is a base thing, which we can never fail to denounce and loath.

We have entered more thoroughly into this subject than our limits ordinarily permit, partly on account of our regard for a gentleman who has rendered eminent service to the body whose principles we advocate, and partly for the purpose of showing the mean arts of detraction to which church writers frequently resort when compelled to refer to the labours of our brethren. The well-earned reputation of Dr. Vaughan is an offence to our opponents which has prompted many ungenerous attacks, distinguished alike by party spleen and intellectual imbecility. Those which we have had under review on the present occasion, partake of the common features of their class, and may safely be left by Dr. Vaughan to the judgment of all impartial men. Two opinions cannot be entertained by the candid of any party respecting the course pursued by his assailant, and we leave Dr. Todd, with little respect either for his intellect or his heart, to enjoy the fruits of his acrimonious and feeble assaults. That there are honourable men amongst our opponents we do not question, but truth compels from us the statement, which we make reluctantly, that such is the bitterness of spirit distinguishing many of them, that we look in vain to their productions for literary integrity, or the common courtesies of life. We regret the fact, not on our own account, but for the sake of our common Christianity, and call upon all our friends to take warning by it. We have nothing to expect from the justice of our opponents, and must therefore befriend ourselves if we would have our literature sustained, or our principles understood by the great body of our countrymen.

In these concluding passages, and in some others, we have given expression to our honest judgment with regard to the labours of Dr. Vaughan; but there are circumstances connected with this controversy which render it expedient that we should so far depart from our custom in such matters as to state that, as regards the substance and form of the *argument* contained in this article, both in respect to the alleged authorship of this Lollard Treatise, and in respect to the character of the Wycliffe MSS.,

and Dr. Todd's papers in relation to them, the writer responsible is the author of 'The Life and Opinions of Wycliffe,' and it is not the wish of Dr. Vaughan to be at all shielded from that amount of responsibility, under the anonymous character of a review.

Art. II. *A Scripture Herbal.* By Maria Callcott. 8vo. pp. 544. Longman and Co. London. 1842.

The beautifully simple motto which Lady Callcott has set upon the title-page of this very handsome book, creates a predisposition in favour of the author, and serves very well to counteract the somewhat chilling effect which this luxurious style of 'getting up' a book sometimes produces; it is from Handel's Oratorio of Solomon—

> 'What though I trace each herb and flower
> That drinks the morning dew,
> Did I not own Jehovah's power,
> How vain were all I knew!'

This favourable predisposition is strengthened when we turn to the preface, and read, 'My chief object and aim in writing this little book has been to induce those who read and love God's written word, to read and love the great unwritten book which he has everywhere spread abroad for our learning.' And we are altogether overcome, when, a little further on, we learn that the production of this work has for three years beguiled the irksome leisure of a sick bed.*

The 'Scripture Herbal' does not, however, need the indulgence which these circumstances would not fail to secure for it.

* Since this article was written, the papers have announced the death of this excellent and truly accomplished lady. She was the wife of Sir A. Callcott, the royal academician, whom she married in 1827, being then the relict of Capt. T. Graham, R.N., as whose wife she travelled in India, and visited South Africa, South America, and other parts of the world. She had other opportunities of travel with her father (Rear Admiral George Dundas), and with Sir A. Callcott. Some of the results are occasionally produced in the present book, and others have been given to the public in her different works, which were rather numerous, and some of them valuable. A memoir in the *Athenæum* describes Lady Callcott as 'noble, direct, generous, forgiving, quick, sensitive, kind, sympathetic, and religious.' All who knew her will hold her memory in affectionate remembrance. Her acquirements and knowledge were extensive. She was an artist both in feeling and practice, an excellent linguist, and her memory was extremely accurate and tenacious. Few women had seen so much of mankind, or travelled so much; and none, perhaps, had turned the results of their activity to more benevolent account. After having been confined to her room by illness (brought on by a ruptured bloodvessel) for *eleven years*, she died Nov. 21st, at the age of fifty-four.

Although intended and fitted for the drawing-room rather than the study, this is, without doubt, the best separate work we possess, in English, on the Botany of the Bible, and it would, in some respects, still be so, were the botanical articles in Dr. Harris's 'Natural History of the Bible,' printed in a separate form.

Lady Callcott enumerates in her Preface the authorities from whom her materials have been chiefly drawn. They are the well known Latin and English books on the subject, with the addition of some travellers, such as Tournefort, Bruce, Sonnini, Russell (Aleppo), and Dr. Royle. In the body of the work, we also perceive, occasionally, the names of Tavernier, D'Arvieux, and Burckhardt. In this list of names (which are the same that occur in Dr. Harris) it is singular how few are there of persons who travelled *in Palestine itself*. It must be very evident that an examination of the *actual* products of the country would be likely to afford the most information concerning those which are mentioned in the Bible. Yet by a singular perversity, this, the most obvious course, appears to have been almost studiously neglected; and even those writers who have gone so far as to perceive that travellers ought to be consulted, have turned to books of travels in Arabia, Egypt, Abyssinia, Persia, and India, all of them countries very different from Palestine in climate and productions, and have passed over the only land whose plants it was really important to consider. Shaw and Hasselquist have been almost the only travellers in Palestine usually consulted, and it appears to have been unknown that there are a hundred other travellers writing in Latin, German, French, Italian, Spanish, and English, from whose works a tolerably complete *Flora Palastinæ* might be compiled. The German travellers are especially rich in such materials, but the labour of collecting them is not to be expected from the compilers of books for the parlour and the drawing-room, and is indeed such as only a very stout student would be disposed to undertake. The right course was perceived by Celsius, in his *Hierobotanicon*, and by Hiller, in his *Hierophyticon*, who availed themselves of such information of this description as they could command; and it is this chiefly which gave to their decisions respecting the plants mentioned in the Bible, that authority to which most subsequent writers have leaned, and which their learning alone would not have secured. Bochart—a great name in this branch of Biblical literature—was at least equal to Celsius as a philologist, and his superior in erudition; but from the insensible rather than the acknowledged influence of this reference to positive facts, it is Celsius, and not Bochart, whose conclusions have been the most implicitly followed. It must be very evident that, without a preliminary knowledge of the phy-

sical constitution and actual products of the country, a writer will be in constant danger of identifying the plants named in the Bible with such as do not and could not grow in the land of Canaan; and, for ourselves, we should hesitate to say that a particular plant was denoted by the scriptural name, until we could ascertain that this plant actually grew in the country. For want of proper attention to this point, some singular mistakes may be found in all the books on Scriptural botany which we possess—this one of Lady Callcott's not excepted.

The present writer takes a very just view of the labours of her predecessors. Of Dr. Harris's *Dictionary of the Natural History of the Bible*, she speaks with just praise; but observes, that 'it is not, as the ingenious writer imagines, so perfect as to supersede the necessity of any other;' which, we will take the liberty of saying, is true also of Lady Callcott's own book, as far as regards the Botany of the Bible. The work of Rosenmüller on the *Mineralogy and Botany of the Bible*, (as translated in the Edinburgh Biblical Cabinet,) was not seen by this lady until her own work was nearly ready for the press. Of this she writes—'At first, the great array of learned names at the foot of each page alarmed me, even more than the words in oriental characters. But I was soon satisfied that Rosenmüller, although a diligent and laborious compiler on Scripture matters, had depended for his botany upon the authors whom I had already consulted; adopting their quotations as his own.' This opinion of Rosenmüller's work will startle many of our readers; but it is just, and, what is more, it applies to nearly the whole of the large work (*Handbuch der Biblischen Alterthumskunde*) of which this is only a portion. Of another important part of it, the *Biblical Geography*, so competent a judge as Professor Robinson pronounces that this 'work appears to have been compiled hastily, and without extensive research.' In fact, the reputation of Rosenmüller, as a Biblical antiquarian, is now very much on the wane *in Germany;* and his character for learning and industry will eventually be found to rest almost exclusively upon his *Scholia.*

Before quitting the 'Scripture Herbal,' we should notice that every description is accompanied by an engraving of the plant described. The drawings were made from nature, or from good authorities (which are named), by Lady Callcott herself, and the engravings appear to have been carefully executed. Many of them of course represent familiarly known products, such as the ash, cucumber, elm, hazel, ivy, leek, myrtle, oak, vine; and it has often occurred to us to doubt the expediency of introducing in works of this description pictorial representations of things with which no one can be supposed unacquainted. An engraving

of a leek, for instance, may be proper in connexion with botanical definitions, or in works intended for the instruction of people in whose countries leeks do not grow; but elsewhere it would seem altogether useless and somewhat absurd. As the cost of such works is thus often much enhanced by pictures of objects which are seen every day, the matter claims this passing notice.

Art. III. *Library Edition of Shakspere.* By C. Knight. 8vo. Vols. I.—VI. London: Knight and Co. 1842.

We can easily imagine the astonishment, not to say consternation, of Mr. Knight, a faithful and enthusiastic editor of the FACILE PRINCEPS of dramatists, (ancient or modern,) when he finds that we propose commencing the present article by a deliberate examination of probably, in his view, the fanatical question, whether it be not the duty of Christians to abstain from reading his favourite author altogether, and to discourage others from reading him; in other words, whether Shakspere ought to be condemned to a sort of *index expurgatorius*, or whether, with certain cautions and limitations, he may still be allowed to go at large: or rather, we propose to consider what is the wisest and most expedient course for Christians to pursue with reference to a large class of imaginative writers, both in verse and prose, of which Shakspere is but a representative. If his name therefore occurs frequently in the present article, it is to be considered only as a single exemplification of our meaning; the principles laid down apply not to him only, but to many others. We further propose to offer a few remarks on the best method of conducting that difficult part of education which relates to the *imagination*—the manner in which the unquestionably natural appetite for fictitious literature may be most safely regulated and gratified.

If our editor's patience and equanimity should not be quite equal to such a discussion—a discussion which he can hardly think less than an insult to his great author, we must beg him to pass on to those parts of this article which more immediately concern himself, where he will find, we trust, matter calculated to compose and pacify him; and, amongst other things, ample proof that his laborious, arduous, and faithful labours have not been overlooked or unappreciated. In the meantime, we hope he will not lightly charge *us* with anything fanatical, without reading what we say; without doing so, all he will be at liberty to infer, and all we are convinced which his known candour will permit him to infer, is, that we proposed to discuss the question,

but whether we discussed it well or ill, or decided it in the affirmative or negative, he must leave to those who feel an interest in it. We can assure him, however, that we feel it necessary to discuss it; that, incredible as it may seem to him, there are ample reasons in our estimation for so doing.

We pass on, then, for the present, from Mr. Knight to the class of persons with whom is our more especial business on the present occasion; whose piety we unfeignedly respect, with whose scruples we know how to sympathize, whose judgments, if wrong, we would seek to enlighten, and if right, to adopt. We need not say that it is a discussion which affects professed Christians only—those who are not, have nothing to do with it; they will seek their amusement, or intellectual excitement, wherever they can get it, and whether it be in Shakspere, or in the pages of more questionable dramatists, will not give them a moment's concern.

We address ourselves, then, to the class of Christians who say, 'In our judgment the danger of moral pollution from the perusal of Shakspere is so imminent, and is so ill compensated by any amount of intellectual gratification or improvement; and, further, we are so incapable of assigning, or even conceiving, a limit between the use and abuse of such an author, that we are determined to proscribe him altogether—neither to read a syllable of him ourselves, nor, so far as we have influence over the minds of others, to suffer *them* to read a syllable of him.'

We have stated the opinions and the resolutions of these persons, as we deem, fairly. In proceeding to canvass that opinion and resolution, and to suggest whether there be not a wiser and better course, we shall not deem ourselves compelled to assert the direct opposite of the proposition on which they lay so much stress. We do not think that any one in his senses, with correct notions of Christian morality, can assert his belief that the pages of Shakspere are wholly innocent, or that he is to be recommended to the indiscriminate perusal of all persons (especially the young), by those who are their instructors and guardians. It is, in our opinion, just one of those many practical questions in which no universal or unlimited propositions can be laid down. It is true that this involves the trouble of assigning limitations in treating the question generally, and even then imposes on every individual the trouble of acting on his own responsibility in adopting those limitations, but this is no more than is necessary in a thousand cases of practical morals, and we must even submit in patience and calmness to endure the prescribed trouble, and to act on the alleged responsibility. It is not permitted to cut the knot; no summary process is possible. To assert exclusively either the one extreme or the other, is but fanatical or

pernicious, and must lead, in our judgment, to more mischief than it can obviate. It may be quite true that very many cannot read Gibbon's History without great danger—danger far greater than could result from reading Shakspere—the danger of losing both their morals and their faith at the same time. Yet to assert that none should read him, would be as foolish as to recommend him to indiscriminate perusal. What should we think of the wisdom of those who should declare, 'Gibbon is so dangerous a writer that we will never either read a syllable of him ourselves, or suffer any over whom we have any influence, to read a syllable of him?' The only course left us—a course not to be evaded—is, that each individual should distinguish carefully the various cases in which the one or the other course should be adopted; should consult his judgment whether it be wise or unwise to read him, or suffer him to be read, by those over whom nature, or commissioned authority, or moral influence, has given any control. It may be said, perhaps, that the instances are hardly parallel; that it is conceivable that there may be many cases in which the perusal of Gibbon may be attended with a preponderance of advantages, but that in relation to Shakspere, no similar cases can be alleged. We might content ourselves with replying that this is begging the question; that to us it appears, as we shall hereafter show, that there are not a few cases where the knowledge of Shakspere is attended with a vast preponderance of advantages; and that, on *that* supposition, even the above admission gives up the argument, since it implies that, if, as in the case of Gibbon, there be any such instances, it is no longer wise to act upon the peremptory principle of rejecting at once and altogether that which is susceptible of abuse.

But, in fact, the objection that the cases of Gibbon and Shakspere are not strictly parallel, does not precisely touch the difficulty we had in view in stating it. We question altogether whether, when it is impossible absolutely to proscribe an author, to exclude him from general literature, as is the case with Shakspere, Gibbon, and a thousand others, it is wise or prudent to attempt a crusade which must be unsuccessful,—which will strike men, whom we would fain influence, as fanatical,—which would so far defeat the very object we have in view, and which would, in the very attempt, absolutely prevent us from exercising a healthful control where it is so especially needed. To form the unlimited resolution, 'I will neither read Shakspere myself, (nor by parity of reasoning, any portion of literature that is not perfectly free from moral taint,) or suffer any whom I can control to do so,—what is it but to renounce altogether the only means of correcting the supposed evil, of exercising a judicious influence over the habits of the young, and by watching and directing their studies in ima-

ginative literature, of preventing the ill effects which might follow from their unaided and clandestine perusal of what they know to be forbidden. That the proposed proscription would be impossible, is to us as clear as any proposition that could be submitted to us. That individual Christians may, if they please, come to the resolution of never peeping into his condemned pages—that they may burn them, banish them from their library, is most certain, but it is equally certain that there are vast numbers even of their fellow Christians whom they will not get to imitate their example; still less those youths dependent on their care, who are not yet Christians, and who are more likely, as all experience proves, to be revolted by such an austerity than to acquiesce in it. These will read him either clandestinely—a thing in itself most undesirable—in their very pupilage, or all the more eagerly and heedlessly the moment they escape from it. We repeat, that to proscribe Shakspere is an absolute impossibility; all that is given us is, to control for good the tendency to become familiar with his writings. He so pervades our literature, lives in such familiar and perpetual quotation, supplies so many of our thoughts, images, and allusions, is cited so frequently even in moral and religious works, that to keep intelligent and educated youth in absolute ignorance of him is impracticable; and as they are sure to meet with others of their own age who have read him, and who will urge *them* to read him, it is almost certain that they will make themselves more or less acquainted with his works. And far happier and safer is it, in our opinion, for a youth to have been introduced under a parent's or instructor's eye, to some knowledge of this author—to have had his excellences and his vices early pointed out—to have acquired a discriminating knowledge of his beauties—and to have been early inspired with a just distaste for his deformities, under a severe, yet judicious criticism, than to be left to take his chance of plunging in absolute ignorance, and without a guide, into his fascinating pages, just when the passions are the strongest, and authority is no more.

If the attempt, then, to proscribe Shakspere be impossible, we cannot think it expedient. One of the reasons we have just given; but as it is a point of great importance, and affects *many other works* besides those of Shakspere—nay, a very large portion of general literature—we are induced a little longer to dwell upon it. We think such systematic proscription inexpedient, then, for the following reasons:—

1. It tends by the inevitable—if you will, the perverse—constitution of the human mind in its present state, to defeat the very object it has in view. It turns curiosity more intensely towards the object; what is absolutely forbidden becomes more strongly desired; a new and adventitious interest is given to what is so

jealously guarded. The expedient of loudly proclaiming that Shakspere is so charmingly wicked, that he must not be read, is about as wise as that adopted in some curiously expurgated editions of impure classics, in which the obnoxious passages, instead of being simply erased, are intimated by an alluring series of asterisks, which at once excite a prurient curiosity and a polluted imagination, and point out precisely the passages of the more ample editions, where both may be abundantly gratified. They form, in fact, an index to the licentious, and save them all the trouble of a long and laborious search. It is not thus we shall act, if we are wise; if we know of any authors who are really dangerous, and respecting whom we have any hope that we may keep the young in salutary ignorance of them, we should take care not to name them at all, instead of setting them down in our *index expurgatorius*. Where there is no power to enforce such an 'index,' we are convinced that it would be but an advertisement to 'heresy,' and would induce ten to read, where it led one to abstain from reading. We could illustrate our meaning at this moment, by saying that such and such authors ought never be read; but acting on our own maxims we do not choose to name them, lest any of our young readers should be immediately tempted to open their proscribed pages. If at any period the young, by some accident, happened to become acquainted with the names of such authors, we should then treat the individual case with all the judgment we possessed; if we saw probability of their perversely meddling with such pernicious lore, we should forewarn them individually of their danger, but should not deem it right to call all the world's attention to the authors we wished to put under the ban of our censorship, lest we might tempt those to read whom we could not prevent from reading, and thus carry the infection beyond the reach of the remedy.

2. The next thing that follows this awakened curiosity respecting what has been forbidden, is the feeling that 'stolen waters are sweet;' and the books to which curiosity has been so strongly turned, are read not only with avidity, but by stealth. Manifold are the evils which follow such a course, and must follow it. If the youth can discover little in the forbidden pages which, in his opinion, could justify his guardian's censures and commands, (a thing which is not uncommon where the said guardian is more than an ordinary purist, and places almost *every* work of fiction in his long catalogue of 'livres defendus,') still, at the best, the wholesome, the indispensable reverence for a parent's or teacher's authority is thereby abridged. But even if the youth does discover such matter, still, unhappily, it is read; and, what is worst of all, it is read *clandestinely*. To

read what is even innocent in our own estimation, under the consciousness we are doing something we wish to hide, and which is forbidden by those whom we are bound to reverence and obey, produces a most unfavourable impression on the mind, and directly tends to rob youth of one of its fairest and most hopeful qualities—ingenuousness. Nor is this all; for, as in the very nature of the case, there can be no open, kindly conference on the subject, between the parent and the child, the tutor and pupil, the very mischief is allowed to work on uncorrected, because it is concealed. It is essential to all sound education, that he who attempts to form the mind of the young should know just what that mind is doing; that all it reads and learns should be open as the day; without this, the attempt to educate is like the attempt to prescribe for a disease where the patient conceals the worst symptoms of his distemper. For our own parts, we are convinced that an error on the side of that laxity which allows the young sometimes to read what is not altogether desirable, provided it be done openly, is less dangerous than tempting them by a too stringent severity to read it by stealth. We are convinced that there are not a few who can bear their personal testimony both to the *fact* that this over-severity has led to the extensive perusal, by stealth, of that which has been forbidden, and to the pernicious effects of such stealth upon the mind itself. We have instances in our own eye at this very moment.

3. It is not to be forgotten that where the *cordon sanitaire* has been too strictly drawn around the mind in youth, human nature is but too likely to avenge itself by excesses when that restraint can no longer be maintained; when the period comes, and it must come, when mere authority can be of no avail. This maxim applies universally, and is a most important one in education. Much of the immorality of the youth in the time of Charles II., is to be rightfully imputed to the artificial restraints, the excessive austerity, in which their rigid forefathers had brought them up. Much of their extravagant love of gay amusement and fashionable finery is to be traced to these causes; the flowing locks, and the silken garments, and the gay ruffles, borrowed more than half their charms from the stiff and quaint attire in which their childhood was arrayed.

In like manner, we think it highly probable that the most reckless, omnivorous, and undiscriminating of novel readers, have been, at all events for a time, those from whom that class of works have been most sedulously and jealously excluded in their youth; teaching them that there is some wonderful unknown delight in their perusal, which they do not fail to hanker after,

and of which they will as little fail to possess themselves, the moment they are no longer under a parent's or a master's absolute control. Thus we know it was with ourselves, and thus we know, from testimony, it has been with others. How much wiser and safer another course would be, we shall have an opportunity of showing, when we come to speak of the best manner of rendering youth familiar with imaginative literature. Suffice it here to say, that he who plunges into it at once, and after a youth of absolute abstinence, does so with all the eagerness with which we seek novel pleasures, without a guide to detect the evil and point out the good, and when wholesome authority can be no longer exerted.

4. We are far from being convinced that the best way to guard the youthful mind from questionable influences, is to attempt to throw around it an *artificial* screen of ignorance. It has long been observed that those who are brought up in the profoundest ignorance of the world, are not the best qualified to combat its temptations, when (and the hour must come) they are left to themselves. We are not, it is true, to place temptations in a youth's way, nor to indoctrinate him in aught that is evil, for the purpose of exercising and disciplining his principles, any more than we are wantonly to expose him to heat and cold to make him robust; but as, on the other hand, we would not mew him up in a room all day, for fear some rude blast should blow upon him, so we would not attempt to seclude him in artificial ignorance of that with which he will one day come in contact, and that for the very reason that he *will* come in contact with it. It is surely better and safer that that knowledge should be gradual rather than sudden, disclosed by incidental notices rather than at once, and under our own eye, than when instruction and authority can no longer avail.—To apply this to the present subject; we certainly would not ordinarily put Shakspere into the hands of a youth still ignorant of him, still less urge him to a perusal; but if he is become already acquainted with his name, as he certainly will somehow or other, and manifests a desire, which if intelligent he also will, to form some acquaintance with him, we should think it far safer to attempt ourselves to give him some knowledge of his beauties and his faults, than to endeavour to perpetuate his ignorance till he is at liberty to dispel it for himself.

5. We are equally far from being convinced that the best way of repelling every moral danger is to make a loud outcry about it; it is so sometimes, no doubt, but not always; and this not merely for the reason already assigned, that in many cases, from the very perverseness of human nature, we immediately invest what is vehemently denounced with an adventitious interest, but because

the very knowledge of the said danger might never have presented itself, had it not been for our solicitude and fidgetiness about it. We have said that it is not possible to prevent a youth's becoming acquainted with Shakspere, but if anything could stimulate a prurient curiosity, make a young mind hunt after impurities, and try to understand equivoques, which might otherwise glance from the mind without being understood or without being heeded, it is the frequent and earnest mention of them. There is many a temptation in this world which would not even be understood, were it not for that over-solicitous purity, or that prudish folly which proclaims it; no doubt with the best possible design, but often with most pernicious consequences. It is sometimes well not to make the young mind too distinctly conscious where danger lies. We have heard a wise and experienced schoolmaster say that when, in translation, his young pupils come upon a questionable passage, which he thinks it most likely they will simply not understand if he does not make a *fuss* about it, he just lets them blunder through it in their own way, when they generally give an obscure and unintelligible version, which, however, answers his purpose just as well as any other; whereas, if he were to say, 'You must omit that passage, it is too indelicate, too gross to be translated,' it is ten to one but he would stimulate the curiosity of his pupils, and that they would never rest till they had mastered it. We do not say that the impurities in Shakspere could in general be as little understood as the said passages in a dead tongue, (though we are convinced that very many of them would be, without an artificial stimulant,) but we do say, that if anything could tempt the mind, which *will* read him, to think of such passages, to be on the look out for them, to dive into their meaning, to give them vividness, it would be the incessant talk about them. There are a thousand evil things which make no impression upon us whatever, simply because we do not know them to be evil, and which we see as though we saw them not, till some kind Mentor, in the plenitude of his wisdom, gives them an interpretation and attracts our attention to them. He who should conduct a youth into a great city, and say, 'Such and such places are the purlieus of licentiousness, there is the lurking place of this vice or that, take care never to go there; such and such are its outward symbols and appearances, beware of them;' might be a very good man, and have very good intentions, but whatever his pretensions to the simplicity of the dove, he would assuredly have none to the wisdom of the serpent. In very many cases, however little he designed it, he would be nothing more nor less than a sign-post to perdition.

For these, and similar reasons, we do not think it wise in Christians to undertake an indiscriminate crusade against Shaks-

pere; and, by parity of reason, against all similar literature, or attempt an absolute and undistinguishing proscription of it. If this course were possible, more might be said for it, if not, the question is fairly open,—'Is such a course expedient, in preference to that of abstaining from all such futile attempts, and endeavouring to regulate that which we cannot prevent?' Our answer, and the reasons for it, we have endeavoured to give, and that without taking into account the positive advantages which a knowledge of this great poet may confer. On this we shall presently touch. In the meantime we may fairly beg those who plead for an opposite course, to recollect how far in consistency they ought to go. This would, in our judgment, at once reduce their argument to an absurdity. For on the same grounds on which they would absolutely proscribe Shakspere, namely, that there is in his writings much which a correct moral taste cannot approve—they ought also absolutely to proscribe Chaucer, Dryden, Pope, Swift, even Spenser, Addison, Steele, and a host of others; almost all dramatic, and a large portion of historic literature. For reasons quite as strong, though not quite the same, they ought also to explode the far greater part of prose fiction, and no inconsiderable portion of philosophy. If such a project be felt to be fanatical and impracticable, and that the attempt to carry it out could only make those who endeavoured to effect it, lose all authority and influence over the very parties whom they wish to protect, there is nothing left for us but to endeavour, with patience and judgment, to extract the evil from the good, and to render a familiarity with a literature which we cannot summarily consign to an Index Expurgatorius, as healthful and as innocent as we can. Nor would it be difficult to show—as is indeed evinced by experience in the immense majority of cases—that a wide knowledge of literature is attended by advantages, intellectual and moral, great enough far to overbalance the evils with which it may be attended. The mental activity it creates and cherishes, the discipline it furnishes to all the faculties, the innocent pleasures it affords, the hours of indolence and vacuity it fills up, the temptations which it shuts out, and which are sure to fasten on the ill-informed or the unemployed, more than repay the danger of occasionally stumbling on a questionable passage, or even on a passage the impropriety of which is not questionable.

At the hazard of being tedious, we must notice one or two indirect objections. It is sometimes said, 'But is the reading of Shakspere an employment in which a Christian would wish to be engaged?' We answer, that if there are any, and we believe there are many, who can truly say, 'we read Shakspere, not for his impurities, (and when we come to them, deeply

lament them and gladly pass them by,) but for the profound knowledge of our nature he confers—for the deep wisdom and the exquisite poetry in which he abounds—for the invigorating stimulus which he imparts, as well as for the mental refreshment that he brings; we read him not to excess, but as an occasional solace from other and more arduous pursuits, and so reading him, we believe that, directly and indirectly, he is of more advantage than disadvantage to us, or rather that the good is considerable, and the evil just none at all;' we see no more reason why they should be ashamed of perusing him, than of doing many other things into which the religious element does not immediately enter. Does the objection imply that the Christian would not wish to do anything, however innocent, into which the religious element does not enter? If it does, it proves too much, and there are few who would be hardy enough to maintain it. If it does not, it does not touch the above-mentioned cases.

But it is further said, 'Though there may be many to whom the moderate perusal of Shakspere may be a source of innocent delight, or even of positive improvement, ought they not to forego it for example's sake?' We reply, first, that this must be left to the individual's judgment, for it does not necessarily follow that in every case we are not to use that which may, by possibility, be abused; secondly, we are to consider whether our neglecting altogether such an author is likely to deter others from reading him; and if we are convinced that it will not, in other words, that the absolute proscription of him is an impossibility, and that such an attempt would be regarded as fanatical, then the question returns, which we have already treated at such length, whether it would not be better to endeavour to regulate what we cannot prevent, and turn to some use what we must otherwise leave to be simply abused?—But if it be meant that we are not to read Shakspere, lest those over whom we have as yet an absolute control, and whom we have a right to command—that is to say, children and pupils,—should be induced to read him from our example; then we reply, that, in our judgment, if education be what it ought to be, no such result need be feared, and that the objection comes rather singularly from those who hold that the parent's and instructor's authority is such that he can absolutely proscribe Shakspere if he pleases. We all know that we do every day a thousand things which we do not permit our children to do, and which, consequently, they never wish to do, and neither they nor we wonder that it should be so. We hold that that system of education is essentially defective which goes upon an opposite principle, and says to the parent or the instructor, 'Never do that which you would not wish your children or pupils to do.' It is a maxim never more than *professedly* acted upon—*practically* it

cannot be. If it be merely meant that we are never to do anything we are convinced is wrong, of course all will assent to it; but there are many things which we are persuaded are not wrong, but which, nevertheless, we should be very sorry to see our children do, before they come to years of discretion. We hold that there has been something radically defective in the education of a child, when, if the question be put, 'May *I* not do this, for I see *you* doing it,' it is not a sufficient answer, 'No, you may not—when you get older you will be able to see why you may not do it now, and why you will be at liberty to do it then; in the meantime you must be willing to yield to my authority, and refrain from doing that which *I* say you must not do, even though I be unwilling to give you the reason, or you incapable of comprehending it, if it were given.' And thus we *do* act in all cases where it suits us, and we never see that any harm comes from it; we give our children different food from what we take ourselves—we take wine, which we do not allow them—we keep different hours—we go where we should not trust them—and lastly, which is more to the point, we all of us *read books with which we should not let them meddle*, and we see no reason why, so far as *this* objection goes, Shakspere should not also be added to the catalogue. Let that parent depend upon it that he is proceeding on a vicious maxim when he protests 'that he will do nothing which he would not let his children do, or for which he cannot render to them a reason.'

What we have said of parents and children applies also to ministers, and the young of their flocks. It is professionally the duty of ministers to read many works of philosophy and theology which he would be very sorry to see familiarly in the hands of his young charge; and for similar overbearing reasons—though not the same—which lead him to read much that is heretical and profane in theology and philosophy, he may choose to cultivate some acquaintance, even with such a poet as Shakspere; that is, that *indirectly*, though not directly, he may be the more thoroughly furnished for his arduous and complicated functions. He may feel that having to work upon mind—the intellect, the affections, the will, of man—it is of vast importance to him to be familiar with those portions of literature which give him the profoundest and truest views of human nature, suggest matter of reflection, stimulate his own intellect and imagination, store it with images, and increase his command of energetic and powerful language. And if *he* honestly feel that he can read Shakspere with these advantages (to say nothing of his rightful title to occasional mental recreation), while on the other hand he can do so without danger of contamination, (and really we must be permitted to smile at the peculiar quality of that

piety which is more likely to be polluted by the impurities of Shakspere, than to be repelled or disgusted with them,) we do say that he is perfectly justified in reading him, even though he should deem his flock had better abstain. We do not affirm that it is a duty of every minister to avail himself of this liberty, or that all need such a stimulus alike, but we do affirm, that he who deems it right to avail himself of it is perfectly justified in saying to any of his flock who blame him for it, 'Far from contending that I read nothing, and ought to read nothing but what I would put freely and without discrimination into the hands of the young, I boldly acknowledge that I do read, and must read, much which I would not wish to see you familiar with.' We think that this is wiser than a questionable attempt to proscribe Shakspere altogether, and far more honest than reading him by stealth—consigning him, when not in use, to some dusty upper shelf, or concealing him behind a screen of theological folios.

But there is assuredly one class in whom it is a *duty* to read Shakspere; and let us not be lightly charged with paradox if we affirm that to that class must be referred all those who say he ought not to be read at all, and who propose to use their influence to proscribe him altogether. For what can be more preposterous than that they should condemn that of which they are ignorant, and set up as censors without the only qualifications which can constitute them judges. If any man really wish to give authority and weight to the opinion that Shakspere had better never be read at all, and would not lose all influence over those on whom he wishes to exert it, let it be seen that he speaks not in ignorance, but from knowledge. On the other hand, if, as we think, such an attempt at sweeping proscription would be inexpedient, because vain and impracticable, it is scarcely less a duty to obtain some knowledge of this author, that we may know in each case how to offer wise and judicious counsel, and to form the minds and the tastes of those who might otherwise obtain an acquaintance with him under far more unpromising circumstances.

We have repeatedly said that we have employed the name of Shakspere only as the representative of a class. What we have said of him equally applies to a large portion of literature, poetical, historical, and philosophical. We have chiefly used his name, only because it is frequently brought up in this controversy, a natural consequence of his vast popularity. We again affirm that it is impossible and unwise to lay down any universal principles, and that we must be content to adopt a course equally removed from a sweeping and short-sighted condemnation of all such literature, and a recommendation that it should be indiscriminately perused by all classes, and by

persons of all ages. We must, as in many other practical cases, be content to form our judgment, and offer our counsel according to the exigencies of individual cases, and any other course would, we are persuaded, for the reasons already so largely assigned, tend to produce far more mischief than it could possibly prevent.*

But we must not quit this subject without laying down some general principles which, in our judgment, ought to be kept constantly in view by those to whom is committed the arduous task of education, in relation to that most difficult and delicate subject, the culture of the imagination.

Locke has written a treatise on the 'Conduct of the Understanding;' another, assuredly not less useful or necessary might

With regard to the objection, quite a distinct one—that the perusal of Shakspere may tempt to the theatre, we deem it requisite to say a few words, and but a few. If the attempt to proscribe Shakspere (and by parity of reasoning, a very large portion of general literature) be, on the general grounds stated by us, inexpedient and unwise, and savouring of something very like fanaticism, it may well admit of question whether this is the best way of endeavouring to repress (and we have no hesitation in saying all Christian parents ought to repress it) a love for the theatre. The young are much more likely to distrust the conclusion that the theatres are an improper place, than to acquiesce in ignorance of Shakspere. In fact, it is endeavouring to gain an object which may be urged on the strongest, most obvious, and rational moral grounds, by questionable and insufficient means. The real, the true reasons for forbidding the theatre, are such as all can equally understand; it is not that dramatic action is represented there, (for it is at least possible to conceive that plays might be acted perfectly free from everything objectionable,—nay, some such are even now acted;) it is the *concomitants* of the theatre—the characters which usually congregate there—the associates likely to be formed—the temptations which are sure to present themselves—the whole moral atmosphere of the place—and we cannot but think that the solemn warnings addressed by a Christian parent on these rational grounds are likely to be both far more intelligible and far more impressive, than a vague hatred and an indiscriminate condemnation of all dramatic literature, especially as the objection must be carried so far as to call in question the judgment of him who urges it, and extend, not only to all dramatic literature, but to all that is capable of being dramatized. We may perhaps further say, that the temptations to go to the theatre, and which do in *nine hundred and ninety-nine cases out of a thousand*, actually prevail with youth, by no means result from an abstract love of the beauties of dramatic literature; that if a man has been so well trained as to appreciate and resist those temptations, it is not a perusal of Shakspere or of Ben Jonson which will be likely to take him to the theatre; and that if he has *not* been so trained he will go there, though he has not troubled his head in reading one page of either. As far as our experience goes (we know not what may be that of others), the most enthusiastic and discriminating readers of Shakspere are those who have not seen him represented, while the most besotted and ardent lovers of the theatre have been but very moderately versed in him,—nay, we verily believe, in the majority of instances, would have been sorry to be condemned to a solitary perusal of him.

be written on the 'Conduct of the Imagination;' for no part of the whole process of education requires a more discriminating judgment or more assiduous care.

As this faculty was implanted in us by the same wisdom which has bestowed every other, we may be sure that it was designed to fulfil important purposes in the economy of human life, and to be, just like them, a source of happiness if rightly used, of misery if not. We may also fairly infer that it falls under the same conditions with all the other faculties, and requires, in order to secure its beneficial exercise, watchful and careful culture. It must in early life be neither pampered nor starved. Either extreme is full of danger. To starve it is no doubt the easiest and shortest method, and relieves the parent or the teacher of all that responsibility and care which we have represented as so imperatively demanded of him. To repress as far as possible all exercise of the imagination—to forbid all works of a fictitious character, is a brief and summary process. But whether it be the best or wisest remains to be seen. If the system be acted upon so severely and successfully as to induce in a youth permanent and habitual distaste to every exercise of the faculty, he is at best sent into the world, not such as a complete education should have made him a *man*, with all his faculties duly and harmoniously developed, but with one essential faculty of his nature dwarfed and stunted—with a maimed and distorted intellect; he is also cut off from one important and fruitful source of innocent pleasures, and which might be, and often are, substituted for others of a more questionable character. But if the process be not successful—the far more frequent case—nature will ultimately assert her rights, and avenge the restraint which has been artificially laid upon her; the consequence will be a more indiscriminate and greedy indulgence in pleasures from which it has been wholly debarred, and with that absorbing and dangerous delight which ever attends absolute novelty: all this, too, when the judgment of others older and wiser is no longer to be had, or is no longer minded. We have been astonished, we confess, at an opinion recently expressed, that inasmuch as poets have too generally been a very wicked sort of persons, it is a question whether the imagination, as if it were a suspected gift of Divine providence, had not better be discountenanced and repressed altogether—doubtless, a very short and easy method for the instructor, but fraught with equal ingratitude towards God, and folly with regard to man. The true method is to exercise in each individual case the diligence, judgment, and care, for which we have so often pleaded, and which are not to be evaded by any such fanatical procedure, dictated by indolence,

impatience, or shortsightedness. The true method is not to prohibit all such reading indiscriminately, but to provide the youthful imagination with its proper, wholesome aliment; to see that while the greater portion of a youth's time is given to robust and strenuous exercises of intellect, these shall not be pursued to the absolute neglect of an important function of his nature; to take care to render those very exercises healthful and beneficial, by alternating them with the pleasures derived from lighter reading, but still so moderately as to show him that such pleasures are to be his recreation and his solace, not his business, the reward and recompence of industry, not the lure and refuge of indolence; to furnish him with such carefully selected works as may early form a high and pure taste, and render him, as he approaches manhood, impatient of what is not in the best style of art; and lastly, to furnish him with this moderate and wholesome aliment *early*, that this peculiar species of enjoyment may not have the dangerous charm of absolute novelty at those years, when, as so often said, authority ceases to exist before reason has assumed its ascendancy, and the youth is in that perilous condition in which he can no longer be controlled by the judgment of another, nor safely depend upon his own;—in a word, when he is no longer a child, and yet is far from being a man. This, we humbly conceive, is a better course than either of the two we have denounced. It is true, the duty is a difficult one, but so are many others, which, no one would suppose, are to be therefore evaded. It is true, it is also difficult, or rather impossible, to select such works as may not be accidentally abused to evil. Even Robinson Crusoe, if tradition speak truth (and there is nothing improbable in the supposition), has sent more than one boy to sea. What then? an objection which proves too much, proves nothing. For the same danger, the same liability to abuse, extends to the cultivation of every faculty, and even to the communication of knowledge in any shape. Is it therefore better that we should be brought up in barbarism and ignorance, because in one case out of a hundred, or a thousand, knowledge itself may be turned to the purposes of vice or infidelity? What is required of us is, to choose that course which on the whole seems to be the safest and the best, and to endeavour to perform our duty with fidelity and circumspection, and to the best of our judgment. If we do nothing in the matter of education, except where we can be quite certain that what we do may not be attended with evil results, we shall do little enough.

We now return to the work, the appearance of which, as will be seen, we have made the mere occasion of this long and, as it appears to us, important discussion. We know not whether the

excellent and indefatigable editor requires any apology for our having so long kept him waiting. We are quite sure, however, there are many to whom the subject we have been treating is of vital interest, and has not seldom grievously perplexed them. If we have said anything which may tend to relieve them, we shall not deem that we have penned these pages in vain.

Our remaining remarks will be exclusively confined to Mr. Knight and his editorial labours. To enter on so familiar a subject as Shakspere's merits, after so many able critics have written so largely upon it, would be somewhat superfluous; and to enter on such a vast field in the narrow space which is all that is left us, would be not a little absurd.

We have no hesitation whatever in saying that Mr. Knight's edition of Shakspere is, in all respects, the most valuable which has yet been given to the public, and that we cannot easily believe that it will soon be rivalled. There are, perhaps, a few commentators on Shakspere who may have exceeded Mr. Knight in power of critical analysis, and some, though not many, who may have surpassed him in antiquarian and bibliographical lore, and who have been more profoundly acquainted with our early literature. But we much question whether there has ever been one who has united to so large an extent, and in such happy combination, the various qualities which the task pre-eminently requires. He conjoins the capacity of thoroughly appreciating the most refined beauties of his author with the most plodding and painstaking diligence in collating editions and forming a text; a discriminating estimate of all the large and subtle views of such commentators as Johnson and Coleridge, with a laborious and exact attention to the minutiæ of verbal criticism. And if his power of analysis is not so great as that of the writers above mentioned, still the reader is not defrauded in this edition of any light they have thrown upon the author. It has, in fact, in addition to all its other merits, that of combining most of what is truly valuable in preceding editions—of furnishing a *resumé* of all the best and most judicious criticisms.

Mr. Knight belongs decidedly to the modern school of Schlegel, Coleridge, and others, whose asthetic principles lead them to a far more 'reverential' and cautious criticism than was manifested by their predecessors. They refuse lightly to believe that expressions which there is any sound reason to believe are as Shakspere left them, can be lightly amended by another hand, or that alleged errors in the conception of a character, or the conduct of the drama in any particular instance, are really such, merely because to a superficial criticism they may appear so; or that apparent marks of ignorance—as, for example, the anachronisms of which Shakspere's commentators have made so

much, may not be often better accounted for upon another principle, namely, that his 'knowledge might have been in subjection to what he required, or fancied he required, for the conduct of his dramatic incidents.'

In a word, he refuses to believe that Shakspere was, as Voltaire is pleased to represent him, a sort of inspired barbarian, who worked in obedience to a blind impulse, but who was destitute of art or method; or that he was the ignorant being many others have been pleased to imagine him. In both these respects we are persuaded that he is in the right, and not less so in the latter particular than in the former. We believe that Shakspere's *powers were universally great*—that his faculty of acquisition was as enormous as his power of invention and combination—that though he might have had but 'little Latin and less Greek,' he devoured all the literature that was then open to him, and that he made more out of that little than other and inferior poets would have made out of ten times the quantity. We believe, then, the principles of the modern Shaksperian school of criticism to be in the main correct, but it is possible to carry them too far in minute instances, and thus to weaken them as applied to the more important. It is thus we think with the defence of minute points, sometimes set up by Coleridge, and we are by no means sure that Mr. Knight has not suffered himself to be now and then betrayed into a similar error. It is not necessary, in order to an adequate appreciation of Shakspere's genius, absolutely to idolize him, or to suppose that his intellect was absolutely free from all mortal infirmities; that he is not guilty of occasional slips and blunders; that he was not subject to moments of obliviousness, or oversights of negligence, like other men. By way of illustrating our meaning, we shall give a brief specimen of what we deem Mr. Knight's excessive enthusiasm. As all the world knows, Shakspere, in his 'Two Gentlemen of Verona,' has represented Proteus as going from Verona to Milan by sea, both being towns far inland: to one who should think proper to object this to Shakspere, the proper and the obvious answer surely is, 'Be it so; say it was an error of ignorance, or, which is more probable, that it was a slip of forgetfulness, and that if the poet had bethought himself for a moment, or if he had not regarded the point as of no moment, he would have put Proteus into a carriage instead of a ship—how is Shakspere's genius affected by it?—what depends upon it?' This is in effect *one* of the answers which Mr. Knight has given — to us it is quite sufficient, and would equally apply to many other points equally insignificant. But this will not altogether suffice our editor in his *general* anxiety to leave

Shakspere chargeable with the least possible amount of error or ignorance. He takes occasion to intimate that the supposed error may have been designed—that there may have been some profound æsthetical reasons for the inadvertence, which our more prosaic generation is too dull to perceive or appreciate; whereupon he offers us a great deal of very ingenious and really beautiful criticism, truly applicable to a great many more important cases, about the 'subjection of the real to the imaginative,' and so forth. We accept, and accept gratefully, the criticism, but deny it to be precisely relevant to the present occasion. We wish it had been reserved for one of the more important cases just referred to, and fear that many, finding it in the place it now occupies, will conclude that it does not apply so forcibly in other cases as it really does, and argue that it is the over-refined speculation of a critic who is determined that his author shall on no occasion be in the wrong; that the admiration and homage it indicates, however profound, are not so discriminating as they should be. This would be unjust in Mr. Knight's case, but it would not to us be matter of surprise, if some so thought. For, in the case of the above inadvertence, it is reasonable to ask, 'What is the proof that Shakspere had any profound or subtle reason for making Milan and Verona seaport towns? What was the necessity here of subjecting the 'real' to the 'imaginative'? What in the conduct of the piece depends upon it?' Absolutely nothing, if we except two or three indifferent puns of Speed and Launce, which Shakspere's exuberant wit and inexhaustible love of verbal quibbling could as easily have produced under any other conceivable alternative. 'But,' it may be said, 'it is still *possible* that there may have been some profound reason, though we cannot discover it.' Why, it is difficult, of course, to prove that there may not have been such a possibility; but we must reason on *probabilities*. Here, on the one side, is a perfectly natural solution of the difficulty—a slip, an inadvertence, with the certainty that Shakspere, as mortal, could not have been free from such things; and, on the other, a bare possibility; even the most acute and sagacious critics, finding it impracticable to assign any worthy reason of the designed commission of the apparent blunder, anything in the conduct of the plot depending on it, anything of dramatic propriety necessitating it! Homage to mortal genius, however great, should be still discriminating; without this quality, it loses a portion of its intrinsic value. It must not be carried so far as to lead us to guess that there may be some subtle propriety in casual inadvertencies, profound wisdom in palpable mistakes, deeper reasons than we wot of, even for the most indifferent actions, though we cannot assign,

or even imagine them; some subtle fetch of policy, some masterstroke of art in stumbling over a stone, knocking at the wrong door, or misdirecting a letter.

Similar remarks apply to attempts to discover some æsthetical propriety in Shakspere's making ancient Greeks talk of 'nuns,' or describing Hamlet as having been at school at Wittemberg. Our answer, in all such cases, still is, 'Be it so; let them stand for inadvertencies, which if the author had thought on the matter, he would not have made;—what of it? Do a score of such things weigh the hundredth part of a scruple in the estimate of his marvellous and superlative genius?'

Mr. Knight, indeed, offers a sort of apology for his indulging in such a long criticism on the insignificant matter, to which we have referred by saying that it 'was necessary, on the threshold of his enterprise, to make a profession of faith with regard to what many are accustomed to consider irredeemable violations of propriety in Shakspere.'

We have already said that we accept the criticism itself; but we again say that we could have wished the principles, and the limits within which they were intended to apply, had been either elaborately set forth in a separate *excursus*, or that they had been reserved for the first *important* case in which they are truly of force. In the main, however, we think Mr. Knight's principles of criticism are perfectly legitimate, and judiciously applied; and perhaps it was unavoidable that an enthusiastic editor should be sometimes tempted to lay a little greater stress upon them than they will bear; for it has been the general fault of biographers and critics, in the case of authors who could furnish far feebler apologies for indiscriminate admiration.

Perhaps a similar observation may apply to some of Mr. Knight's elaborate criticisms on minute and very doubtful points. They may be partly defended on the plea, that nothing regarding Shakspere can be uninteresting, and partly excused on the ground that it is impossible for his commentators not to become enthusiasts. We can pardon much to the spirit of a diligent and genial editor.

The general 'Preface' contains an account, so far as it can be authentically ascertained, of the number of Shakspere's works, of the order in which they appeared, of the dates of their publication, and of the principles on which Mr. Knight has proceeded in forming his text. In Mr. Knight's opinion, Shakspere commenced the composition of his dramas, at least five years before the period generally assigned,—that is, about 1585, instead of about 1591. We confess, that to our minds he has made this matter abundantly clear; nor do we see how any man with his observations in mind can hereafter apply Spenser's well-known allusion

contained in the lines, entitled, the 'Tears of the Muses,' published in 1591, (in which the author of the 'Faery Queen' speaks of 'our pleasant WILLY,') to any other dramatist than Shakspere, and sooth to say, even without them, it is difficult to comprehend how any one could have applied them to any of his contemporaries.

The judgment and diligence displayed by Mr. Knight in the formation of his text, is deserving of all praise. He has very properly taken the folio of 1623, published by Shakspere's 'fellows,' John Heminge and Henry Condell, for his basis, carefully collating with it the quarto editions of those separate plays which had been already published.

That it was very necessary that the common text, or rather texts, of Shakspere should receive a thorough revision, is abundantly plain, if we consider the liberties which a long succession of critics had thought proper to take with him, especially Steevens, whose text, if any, may be considered the '*received*' one. Steevens began well; but how he ended will best appear from his own candid confession contained in the following citation from Mr. Knight's preface:—

'Steevens set out upon principles which deserve every commendation. He begins his 'advertisement to the reader' thus:—'The want of adherence to the old copies, which has been complained of in the text of every modern republication of Shakspere, is fairly deducible from Mr. Rowe's inattention to one of the first duties of an editor. Mr. Rowe did not print from the earliest and most correct, but from the most remote and inaccurate of the four folios.' He then states that he had gone through the task of collation with the authentic copies, adding, 'the reader may be assured that he who thought it his duty to free an author from such modern and unnecessary innovations as had been censured in others, has not ventured to introduce any of his own.' He further goes on to say: 'The text of Shakspere is restored to the condition in which the author, or rather, his first publishers, appear to have left it, such emendations as were absolutely necessary alone admitted; for where a particle, indispensably necessary to the sense, was wanting, such a supply has been silently adopted from other editions; but where a syllable or more had been added, for the sake of the metre only, which at first might have been irregular, such interpolations are here constantly retrenched, sometimes with, and sometimes without notice.' If Steevens had worked throughout his life in this spirit, he would have deservedly earned the thanks of every reader of Shakspere, and the duty of an editor coming fifty years after him would have been less disagreeable. But Steevens's edition of 1793, which goes by the name of 'his own edition,' and upon which all the modern texts, with the exception of Boswell's, are founded, was executed in a spirit, the total opposite of the principles laid down by the same editor twenty years before. . . . . We must extract a passage from his preface of 1793, which is comprehensive enough to

show upon what principles the received text of Shakspere is founded, and which is, truly, no vain dream of imaginary perfection in an editor who would start back,

' E'en at the sounds himself had made ;'

but of one who carried out his theory with a most unflinching perseverance, and who grew bolder and bolder with every new experiment. ' It is time, instead of a timid and servile adherence to ancient copies, when (offending against sense and metre) they furnish no real help, that a future editor, well acquainted with the phraseology of our author's age, should be at liberty to restore some apparent meaning to his corrupted lines, and a decent flow to his obstructed versification. The latter (as already has been observed) may be frequently effected by the expulsion of useless and supernumerary syllables, and an occasional supply of such as might fortuitously have been omitted, notwithstanding the declaration of Heminge and Condell, whose fraudulent preface asserts that they have published our authors' plays as absolute in their numbers as he conceived them. Till somewhat resembling the process above suggested be authorized, the public will ask in vain for a commodious and pleasant text of Shakspere. Nothing will be lost to the world on account of the measure recommended, there being folios and quartos enough remaining for the use of antiquarian or critical travellers, to whom a jolt over a rugged pavement may be more delectable than an easy passage over a smooth one, though they both conduct to the same object.'

' Without the most careful and complete examination of the text of the early copies of Shakspere, as compared with the modern texts, it is impossible to form any notion of the extent to which the corruption has reached through this dogged pertinacity, and we add with pain, besotted ignorance, on the part of an editor, whose natural acuteness, elegant acquirements, and neat style, gave him an influence over the public of his day, of which we inherit the evil fruits. Malone was the only man who ventured to stand up against Steevens; but Malone's natural strength would allow no prolonged fight, and his weapons and his armour were of the most fragile of critical equipments. Malone was bred in the same school of metrical harmony as Steevens, but he had a greater terror of innovation; and when Steevens, therefore, came with his ' expulsion of useless and supernumerary syllables, and an occasional supply of such as might have been fortuitously omitted,' Malone was ready with his minute proofs, that what is usually received as a monosyllable, was in reality a dissyllable, and *vice versâ*. Neither of them had the slightest notion of that variety which dramatic versification essentially requires, and of which, we conscientiously believe, Shakspere was the first, the very first, to exhibit the example.'

Of Mr. Collier's edition we know nothing, not having had an opportunity of inspecting it. But we have read attentively the prospectus with which he has ushered it into the world, and Mr. Knight's remarks thereon. We must think that Mr.

Knight has ample reason to complain of injustice. While Mr. Collier reasonably complains of the state of Shakspere's text, as it is found in ordinary editions, and of the negligence or presumption of his editors, he takes no notice whatever of Mr. Knight's labours; or rather, by this course, tacitly leaves it to be inferred that Mr. Knight's text is equally defective with the rest, and that he, too, is to be classed amongst the negligent and incompetent editors. So far from this being the case, Mr. Knight, in our judgment, has really offered the public the very desideratum which Mr. Collier is so solicitous to supply. Mr. Collier talks indeed, somewhat mysteriously, of some exclusive sources of information, on which he places great reliance; but whatever they may be, (though we confess that we should place greater reliance on Mr. Collier's undoubtedly extensive acquaintance with the history of the drama, and on his vast bibliographical lore,) we question whether he can produce a better text than that with which Mr. Knight has furnished us.

But the merits of Mr. Knight's edition do not end with the text. It is scarcely even the chief merit. Each play is preceded by an ample 'introduction on the chronology, state of the text, supposed sources of the plot, period of the manners and action,' &c., full of curious historical matter, and containing much valuable criticism; while each is followed by a 'supplementary notice,' in which the opinions of other critics, as well as those of the Editor, on the characters, incidents, and principal passages, are given at length. Nor is this all. Each act, almost every scene, is accompanied by a body of annotations and 'illustrations,' full of curious and amusing information on the laws and usages, manners and customs, of our ancestors, and forming altogether no inconsiderable mass of traditional and antiquarian lore. These matters are profusely illustrated by those pictorial embellishments, which so largely characterize the literature of the age, and which stamp the present edition of Shakspere with so novel and unique an interest. Many, very many, of them are of great merit as works of art. The most valuable amongst those published in the 'Pictorial Edition,' have been transferred to the 'Library Edition;' we heartily wish that all of them could have been so transferred, though we do not know how it could have been well managed on the more moderate page of the later edition.—We had almost forgotten to mention, as a further recommendation, that the whole work is accompanied by a running commentary, ample enough, but not too ample, of foot notes, containing all the principal *variæ lectiones*, the reasons which have guided the editor in his preference of one word or phrase to another, and explanatory remarks on obsolete terms, or obscure passages.

There are many passages in Mr. Knight's 'Introductions' which we should like to have extracted, but we have exhausted, and more than exhausted, the space allotted to us. We can only return him our best thanks for the pleasure and entertainment he has afforded us.

Art. IV. *Correspondence of John, Fourth Duke of Bedford; selected from the Originals at Woburn Abbey. With an Introduction,* by Lord John Russell. Vol. I. London: Longman.

The latter part of the first half of the eighteenth century was a time of fierce political contention. The lower house, nominally only the representative of the nation, was broken up into sections, which contended against each other with an acrimony partaking largely of the bitterness of personal strife. There was little of principle, and still less of patriotism, in the struggles of that period. The great majority of the Commons were intent on anything rather than the welfare of their constituents, and the reports which we possess of their debates—brief and meagre as they are—are evidences of disappointed ambition, fretted vanity, or personal hatred, rather than of an enlightened and honest devotion to the good of the nation. Sir Robert Walpole was the minister of the day, but his long tenure of office was evidently drawing to a close. The causes which contributed to his overthrow were partly personal and partly official, derived in some measure from the dissatisfaction of his colleagues with his avowed supremacy, and still more from his foreign policy running counter to the views of the King.

Walpole became First Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer in the spring of 1721, when the dangers arising from the intrigues of the Tory party with the Pretender, and the questionable position of the hierarchy, exposed the nation to fearful perils. The death of Queen Anne, which occurred about six years before, had been anticipated with considerable hope by the adherents of the exiled Stuarts. The evidence we now possess leaves no room to doubt of the negotiations which were on foot just prior to that event, and which there is good reason to believe were connived at, if not sanctioned, by the feeble-minded and bigoted Queen. The strength of the Stuart party at that time was considerable, and the danger accruing from them by no means trifling. 'Among their favourers and well-wishers,' as Lord Russell remarks, in his *Introduction* to the present volume, 'were to be reckoned, in England, the landed gentry, a large portion of the clergy, the University of Oxford; in Scotland, many of the Highland clans, and the episcopal gentry; in Ireland,

the Roman catholics, the great majority of the population of that island.' Against this formidable array were opposed, the Whigs and the Dissenters, the latter of whom were unanimously zealous for the house of Hanover. At one time the result was doubtful,—the scale trembled in the balance, and even bold men began to tremble for the safety of English liberty. Happily, however, the danger was averted, and lasting gratitude is due to the men by whom the ark of our freedom was preserved from captivity. The Whig leaders of 1714, by the promptitude and vigour of their movements, paralysed for a season their Tory opponents, defeated their intrigues, and secured to a new and protestant dynasty the peaceful possession of the sceptre of these kingdoms. Such was the state of parties a few years prior to the premiership of Walpole, and it had experienced little change up to that event. The loyalty of dissenters had been rewarded by the repeal of the act against occasional conformity and that restraining education; but the favours thus shown, though in harmony with the avowed principles of the Whigs, and well merited by the services rendered, only served to embitter the hostility, and to render more active the intolerance, of the church. Sir Robert Walpole perceived this, and on coming into power resolved to abandon his zealous and confiding allies, in order to conciliate the most embittered of the enemies of his party. 'Walpole,' remarks Mr. Hallam, 'more cautious and moderate than the ministry of 1719, perceived the advantage of reconciling the church as far as possible to the royal family and to his own government; and it seems to have been an article in the tacit compromise with the bishops, who were not backward in exerting their influence for the crown, that he should make no attempt to abrogate the laws which gave a monopoly of power to the Anglican communion.'* This has been the usual course of the Whig party, marvellously short-sighted, it is true, yet still persisted in to our day. The forlorn hope of reconciling an implacable enemy continues to be cherished, and former services are in consequence frequently forgotten, and the claims of justice denied. But let this pass.

Walpole was premier when John, Duke of Bedford, whose *Correspondence* is now before us, took his seat in the House of Lords at the age of twenty-two. This was in the year 1732, when the power of Walpole was at its height, though he himself was 'the object of much popular invective, and the theme of much eloquent declamation.' The duke at once ranged himself in the ranks of opposition, and took an active part in many debates, impugning the foreign policy of the ministry, and charging them with despotic and corrupt practices in their conduct of the

* Const. Hist. iii. 333.

home government. The majority of Walpole was gradually broken down. Some of his colleagues proved treacherous, many were discontented at his monopoly of power, and the Prince of Wales, in avowed opposition to his father's government, sought to array all the influence and talent he could command against his minister. William Pitt, afterwards Lord Chatham, was at this time a comparatively young member of the house, and his impassioned eloquence, inflamed with all the warmth of personal resentment, was directed against the minister, whom he denounced for his corruptions, and probably envied for his power. 'We must muzzle that terrible cornet of horse,' said Walpole, when he first heard the withering oratory of Pitt; and, as if his evil genius possessed him in this matter, he proceeded from bad to worse, till the young officer was deprived of his commission, and rendered an enemy for life. On the 9th of February, 1742, Walpole was created Earl of Orford, and two days afterwards he resigned the seals of office.

The administration which succeeded Walpole was but short-lived. The great leader of opposition was bought off with a peerage, and lost at once the admiration and the confidence which his talents and popular services had inspired. It is difficult satisfactorily to account for Pulteney's conduct on this occasion. Seldom had so much political power fallen to the lot of any man. The king and the ministers were dependent on his pleasure; he possessed a clear majority in the house, and was sustained by the strong and almost universal feeling of the nation, yet, to adopt the language of a modern historian, 'he eagerly made terms for himself and a few of his particular friends, bartered his popularity and consistency for a peerage, and assented to an arrangement which offered little prospect of any change of measures.'* Pulteney, it must be remembered, was a thorough Whig, and had held office, together with Lord Carteret, under Walpole. His character was well known by the statesman whom he had served, and his patriotism was therefore subjected to the smile and private solicitations of the king. Having brought about an interview between his rival and George II., Lord Orford exultingly exclaimed, 'I have turned the key of the closet upon him.' The purpose of the minister was effectually accomplished, but the country lost the services of a man from whom it was entitled to look for high-minded and consistent patriotism. Lord Wilmington, whose incapacity was notorious, was made first lord of the treasury, Lord Carteret secretary of state, and Lord Winchelsea first lord of the admiralty. The ministry thus formed was unquestionably a Whig ministry, and, with that preference of rank

* Cooke's Hist. of Party, ii. 305.

above talent which has usually distinguished the tactics of that party, permitted Mr. Pitt to be excluded from its number. That celebrated man was at this time thirty-four years of age. He had already distinguished himself by the great vigour of his parliamentary eloquence, but mere talent, when unsustained by family alliances and a great name, was insufficient to recommend him to the leading Whigs. 'The reader will observe in the course of these letters,' remarks Lord John Russell, 'some curious proofs of the preference given to high rank and great fortune in the distribution of the principal offices of the state.'

Lord Wilmington's death, in 1743, led to a reconstruction of the cabinet, and opened the way for the Duke of Bedford's accession to office,—Mr. Pelham becoming premier, and the Duke of Bedford first lord of the admiralty. In this post he continued till 1748, after which he was secretary of state for two years. The letters published in the present volume relate principally to the former of these periods. They comprise many details of his naval administration, throw considerable light on the temper and political relationships of several public men, and are full of information respecting the negotiations which preceded the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle. 'They are almost entirely letters of business, and are chiefly valuable as authentic memorials of public affairs, during a part of the history of this country as a free and powerful state.'

We must now proceed to lay before our readers a few specimens of the letters contained in the collection, and the first we shall give is from the Earl of Bath to the Duke of Bedford, in which the writer attempts to vindicate himself from the charges preferred against him. The confidence expressed in the early part of the extract could hardly have been cherished by Pulteney.

'I agree with your Grace that measures must be changed as well as men, and I verily believe they will be so. Abroad, at least, they manifestly are, and much for the better in every respect. At home it must be our own faults if they are not mended. But whatever turn affairs may chance to take, I am confident that I can justify my own conduct to the world in a very few words. I will only ask this single question, what do I get for myself, after labouring with indefatigable pains for twenty years? Nothing but what I was offered, even at that time; and how I persisted in refusing it till I saw most of my friends provided for in the manner they desired. I wish I could have made the change a little more general; but I know where to lay the blame of that likewise, if it becomes necessary to speak the truth. Upon the whole, I am very sure it is right to make the best of what has been done, and all unite in supporting the honour of our country, this family on the throne, and the present constitution freed from corruption.'—vol. i. pp. 11, 12.

The following, from the Earl of Leicester to the Duke, respect-

ing the electioneering proceedings of Harwich, shows that the practices lately so notorious in that borough are not of modern growth. The letter is dated August 2nd, 1745 :—

'Thus your Grace sees plainly how truly I judged, in telling you, and also Mr. Pelham, though he will not yet believe me, that Philipson's views were to get the borough absolutely to himself, independent of the government; which plainly appears by his having got such people into places as he could depend upon as his own friends, even so far as to lose their places rather than act against him, and those he had been in no way instrumental in putting into office he had so far ingratiated himself to, before he would consent they should be chose on the floor, yet even they would lose their places rather than vote against his interest, even for a member of the corporation ; how much, therefore, could be influenced by him for a member of parliament! He works so well with those under me, that they not only refused my orders in the choice of a burgess, but, even while in place under me, and in my chief trust, infamously betrayed me, and not only by my interest brought in his creatures upon the floor, but got them places from me myself, till by his (Philipson) trying to work out Leaths, who first supported him, I had, by Leaths, the whole affair discovered to me. As for Orlibar, surgeon to the sick and wounded, I fear he will act as the others under your Grace have done, for Leaths in order to know how far he would obey Lord Sandwich's commands, endeavoured to speak to him, and even wrote to him, but to no purpose: he could not get an answer. Thus you see how he has contrived to manage all those depending on your Grace's office, and the chief under mine ; and if Mr. Pelham, who now supports him, does not immediately take care, he will get such into his as Mr. Pelham will have as little power over, and become absolute master of the borough, in spite of the government, but that is no fault of ours; I hope, yet, we may have a struggle for it, and, happen what will, I have had what I value much more than the greatest success in that or any other borough, proofs of your Grace's and Lord Sandwich's goodwill to me, which I assure you will ever make the strongest impression on me.'—ib., pp. 31, 32.

A similar remark may be made, respecting the following, from Mr. Grenville to the duke, under date of Dec. 1, 1746 :—

'I received your Grace's obliging letter enclosing one to me in favour of my brother the Captain, for which I give you a thousand thanks. By what we hear from Bridport, I should hope he would meet with success there, if he has only a subject to contend with; but it is given out that an *unlimited credit* has been sent down to that place, and that Mr. Drax, secretary to H. R. H., carries it. The person in whose behalf it is to be exerted is Colonel Madan, one of the Prince's equerries. If this should be the case to the extent that it is reported (which I can't believe till I see the effects of it), to be sure my brother will be defeated, as it will then be no match: however, be that as it may, I am sure he will always remember with infinite plea-

sure that he had the honour of your Grace's good wishes and recommendation.'—ib., p. 199.

A letter from Mr. Legge, an old friend and political supporter of the duke, from which we transcribe a paragraph, affords a singular illustration of the complex and very questionable influences which regulate the exercise of patronage. All departments of the state might furnish like specimens in great abundance. Such jobbing, however, ought to be discountenanced by every honest minister, whatever the post he fills.

'A certain lord (whom I know you don't delight in no more than your humble servant does) made me a visit this morning; and, after asking several questions concerning your Grace's kind intentions towards Palliser, gave me to understand that he had thoughts of soliciting your Grace to give that sloop, when vacant, to his brother, and seemed to wish that if I had an opportunity I would co-operate with him. The supposition of my being at all able to assist with your Grace I own was flattering, and I could not help feeling that I liked it very much; but upon recovering my senses, I find that though I am very indifferent as to the successes of that noble family, I am by no means so as to your Grace's ease and happiness, and can only see this in the light of an occasion which may be made to contribute more or less to your own quiet. If it is not done for him he will certainly continue to tease and lay perpetual schemes till it is. He will perhaps plead the examples of Sir John Norris, Sir John Franklyn, Lord Harry Powlet, &c. &c., and of all other lords of Admiralty, who have never failed to give most partial preference to their brothers and sons; and, indeed, the service in general are so used to it, and expect it so much of course, that when it happens they never are surprised or repine at all at it; on the contrary, if it is done with a good grace for his brother, he must be the most ungrateful dog living if he forgets the obligation, or knows any other rule for his conduct at the Board but that of making your Grace happy. To do him justice, he talks in the style of one who would not breed dissensions at the Board; and I rather impute his past behaviour to youth, impertinence, real ignorance of the world, with an opinion of his own to the contrary, than to badness of heart. But I know very little of his inward man; and as to his outward, there is but little of it to know, which is a good symptom.' —ib., pp. 150, 151.

Several notices occur in the course of these letters, of the desperate expedition of the young Pretender in 1745, and they are interesting, as showing the light in which the enterprise was regarded before its result had been attained. Writing from Dublin Castle, under date of September 17th, 1745, the Earl of Chesterfield remarks:—'By the accounts we have from Scotland nothing is more ridiculous than that rascally Highland army with which his Royal Highness Prince Charles intends to conquer us, except it be our army, that runs away from such a pack of

scoundrels. But if they have no foreign assistance, which your grace will take good care to prevent or intercept, there must be soon an end of them, one way or another. I wish other things, now depending, may end as well as I am persuaded this rebellion will.'

The following letter from the private secretary of the Duke of Newcastle, announces the defeat of the Pretender, by the forces under command of the Duke of Cumberland, and it contains some particulars which will be interesting even at the present day:—

'My Lord,—I have the honour to acquaint your Grace, that a messenger arrived this day with letters from his Royal Highness the Duke of Cumberland, dated at Inverness the 18th instant, and containing further particulars of the victory obtained by his Majesty's troops over the rebels; which appears to have been more considerable, as to the number of men lost by them, than was at first imagined. The account sent by his Royal Highness makes the number of the rebels killed, on the field of battle, and in the pursuit, to amount to 2000: other letters, by this messenger, say 2500; and they all agree that the rebels themselves acknowledge that they have lost from 3000 to 4000 men. Many of their chiefs are killed; among whom are Lord Strathallan, Lord Balmerino, (and, it is strongly reported, the Duke of Perth, though that is not so certain,) Cameron of Lochiel, Appen, Kinloch, and many others of the rank of Colonel; and it is supposed by the rebel prisoners that many of their chiefs are killed who are not yet known. There is a long list of prisoners, many of which are of considerable rank; but I do not find Murray of Broughton's name amongst them. All their cannon, all their baggage, and twelve colours are taken; in short, there never was known a more total defeat. The Pretender's son fled very early, and was seen to pass Fort Augustus, with only eight men in his company. He lay that night at Lord Lovat's. Brigadier Mordaunt was sent the next day by his Royal Highness into that country, and went to Lord Lovat's house; but found it empty, and left it in flames. The rebels are supposed to be, in a manner, totally dispersed; his Royal Highness not having been able to learn that there was any considerable number of them anywhere together, so that he was at a loss which way to pursue them.

'We had about fifty men killed, (officers included, of whom there were none of the rank of Captain, but Lord Robert Kerr and Captain Grossette,) and about 250 wounded. The Earl of Cromartie and his son, Lord Macleod, with about 150 private men, are brought prisoners from the county of Sutherland to Inverness.'—ib., pp. 75, 76.

Lord John Russell, after giving a list of the principal members of the Pelham administration, points out two remarkable facts in its construction: the one, that Lord Bath should have belonged to it, and the other, that Mr. Pitt should have been excluded. Referring to the latter circumstance, his lordship says:—

'Mr. Pitt, as the most eloquent orator, and most brilliant of the rising men of his day, had a fair claim to office on the retirement of Lord Granville. The Pelhams intended that he should be secretary at war. But his invectives against the Hanover troop measures had sunk deeply into the mind of the king, and the royal prejudice could not for the present be overcome. Mr. Pitt, with a forbearance and regard for his friends highly honourable to him, gave his cordial support to Mr. Pelham, and was content to wait, aware that his talents were more powerful to raise, than the royal aversion to depress him.' —ib., p. xxxvii.

To this aversion of the king, the letters before us make several allusions, but it was compelled ultimately to give way before the rising genius and splendid parliamentary powers of the great debater. 'I ordered Mr. Stone,' writes the Duke of Newcastle to the Duke of Bedford, April 28, 1746, 'to acquaint you that we had prevailed with the king to make Mr. Pitt paymaster. His majesty was determined not to give him the war office.' The latter appointment fell to the lot of Mr. Fox, which brought into close official connexion the fathers of the men who, in subsequent times, divided between themselves the confidence and the leadership of the two great parties into which the Commons House was divided.

The following letter, from Admiral Anson to the duke, contains an account of one of those naval engagements which served to revive the spirit of the English nation at a period of general depression. It is dated from the 'Prince George,' May 11, 1747. The desire expressed, that the French admiral 'had had a little more strength,' is thoroughly characteristic:—

'My Lord Duke,—I know your Grace will have great satisfaction in hearing that anything is done to the disadvantage of the enemy, and especially that it has fallen to the lot of one who has long been patronised and honoured with your friendship; and therefore the 3rd of May gave me the most sensible pleasure I ever felt, when I came up with a squadron of French ships, consisting of five ships of the line, and two frigates of 44 guns. They were going upon two expeditions, one to India, the other to America, and would have done much mischief to this country if they had succeeded, which is effectually prevented, having now in my possession the five largest men-of-war, and four of their richest India ships; and am in great hopes that the Yarmouth, Monmouth, and Nottingham, which I detached to pursue their transports and merchant ships, which are thirty in number, will destroy them all. The enemy's ships behaved well; but I could plainly perceive that my ships made a much hotter fire, and much more regular than theirs, when they had a superior number, which they had in the beginning, before the ships in the rear could get up. Your Grace will be much concerned to hear that Captain Grenville died an hour after his leg was cut off above the knee: he was by much the cleverest officer I

ever saw. Boscawen got a shot in the shoulder, but is almost well; his behaviour in the action pleased me, and I hope your Grace will make him a rear-admiral. As the Defiance is vacant, I should be obliged to your Grace if you would give her to Captain Bentley, who has been my captain this cruise, and is very deserving of a cruising ship. How cordially have I cursed the Dutch, who, I find (by the French general Jonquiere), prevented his whole fleet falling into my hands the last winter, when he came from Chibaton by one of their vessels, informing him he was within twenty leagues of me, and must see me the next morning, upon which he altered his course, and steered for Rochfort. However, I have caught him at the rebound, and ought to be satisfied, but wish he had had a little more strength, though this is the best stroke that has been made upon the French since La Hogue; and I am pleased that something has been done by the fleet whilst your Grace has presided over us; and if you quit us, which I never think of without uneasiness, Lord Sandwich will come to a Board not quite sunk in its credit. He is the only person in the kingdom, after your Grace, that I will serve under: if he continues there seven years, and I live as long, I will never quit him, for I esteem him much. There was 200,000*l.* in specie on board the French ships, and they say the equipping these expeditions cost a million and a half sterling. The Invincible is a prodigious fine ship, and vastly large; I think she is longer than any ship in our fleet, and quite new, having made only one voyage. I hope the Duchess is dismissed from her office of private secretary, and that you both enjoy as perfect health and happiness as is the wish of, &c. &c.'—ib., pp. 213—215.

The naval administration of the Duke of Bedford closed in the following year, in consequence of Lord Chesterfield having resigned the secretaryship of state. To that post the Duke succeeded, and brought to the discharge of its duties the same soundness of judgment and vigorous industry which had distinguished him in his former appointment. None of the letters in the present volume relate to the engagements of this office, and the latter part of them pertain almost exclusively to the negotiations at Aix-la-Chapelle. A brief passage in one, from the Duke of Newcastle, shows, that in 1748 the Oxford University was not very loyally disposed to the house of Hanover. It is addressed to the Duke of Bedford, and is as follows:—

'There is also another affair of importance that requires immediate consideration: the University of Oxford are come with their address. It is so indecent and improper, that, in my humble opinion, it ought to be considered, first, whether the King should receive it, then, if received, what answer should be given to it. It will be necessary to consider this with the bishops, and that cannot well be put off longer than Monday evening.'—ib., pp. 594, 595.

We shall be glad to receive the second volume of this work, and in the meantime recommend it to all such of our friends as

are interested in knowing more of the times referred to than our general histories supply. For ourselves, we value the work highly, and unhesitatingly pronounce it to be a valuable addition to our historical literature.

Art. V. 1. *Wesleyan Methodism Considered in Relation to the Church; to which is subjoined a Plan for their Union and more effective Co-operation.* By the Rev. Richard Hodgson, M.A., Evening Lecturer of St. Peter's, Cornhill. Hatchard and Son, Piccadilly.

2. *Wesleyan Tracts for the Times.* No. 1. '*Why don't you come to Church?*' No. 2. *Wesleyan Methodism not Schism.* No. 3. *Apostolical Succession.* No 4. *Wesleyan Ministers true Ministers of Christ.* No. 5. *Modern Methodism, Wesleyan Methodism.* Mason, Wesleyan Conference Office, City Road.

The chain of causes and effects it is sometimes difficult to trace, even in physical science, in mental and moral it is much more so. He is a skilful and philosophic historian who can clearly and satisfactorily detect the agencies in the distant past, which have contributed to shape the present to what it is; but he must possess gifts more than human, who can foreshow from present agencies, the results which yet remain to be developed. We of course pretend to no such insight into the future. Prognostication, or divination, falls not within the province of reviewers, whose exclusive business is with the progeny of the press, or the events transpiring in the world and the church. Yet there are tendencies in most things; and in the things of our own times there lie embryos of great and important events. For the issues, which are at no man's command, we must be content submissively to wait.

What will be the future effects of the controversies now agitated none can foretel, though many may indulge themselves in speculations and guesses. The revival and spread of high-church principles has quickened all parties into action. The battle is joined on every side. The house divided against itself has not merely disturbed, but alarmed its neighbours. Puseyism, however, is no novelty. It has long existed, it has always been festering within the church of England. But its offensiveness, its aggressions, its challenges, and its assumptions—are novelties. Few persons would have ventured, fifteen or twenty years ago, to predict that it would find, among the ranks of protestant clergymen and university professors, champions bold enough to head a party for open hostilities against the Reformation, and frantic enough to assert a title to that territory which Rome had appropriated to herself; or rash enough to advise the people of

Great Britain to sue for a joint-proprietorship in the inheritance. But so it is.

Then again, who could have imagined that a party, so utterly disconnected from the church as the Wesleyan methodists, would have felt this controversy as an imperious call upon them to engage in strife from which they have usually kept aloof, or that they would have ventured to implicate themselves as a church, or connexion, or conference, (we know not which term best suits the case) in a debate, the agitation of which among themselves, may lead to consequences which none can foresee, but which many may live to deplore! But so it is; and the world can no longer doubt that men so wise in their generation as the leaders of Conference are allowed to be, have felt the Puseyite controversy touching them in more points than one. They are not persons to be drawn into thriftless contention. They are not accustomed to essay works of supererogation, and the fact that they have designed a series of controversial and defensive Tracts for the Times, is an unequivocal proof that they have perceived the utility as well as felt the need, of such prophylactics.

It would be too curious, and perhaps too delicate an inquiry for us to pursue,—what facts or causes can possibly have induced these gentlemen to bethink them of so unusual a measure? What tendencies appearing among their own friends could have awakened these alarms? Or what desertions, or fears of desertions, could have induced a body so friendly to mother-church, so decidedly favourable to her politics and her polity, to bring forth the whole weight of its ecclesiastical authority to check its fond pretensions, and rebuke the madness of the prophet? Some persons have insinuated that their more respectable ministers and people, (respectable of course in worldly circumstances,) have preferred to bring up their sons to the church, rather than to Methodism; others have stated that some students and young ministers have gone over from Methodism to Puseyism; and again others trace these facts to another—that Methodism itself fosters priestcraft, and begets an inkling for ecclesiastical domination. But of course we affirm nothing of the sort; and we take upon us to repress the prying spirit which seeks to know more concerning the causes in which these tracts have originated, than the tracts themselves disclose. The facts alleged are in substance, that the clergy, looking at the Wesleyans as the most recoverable part of their estranged flocks, have been using of late extraordinary means to recover them; and means which 'compromise some of the most sacred principles of morality.' 'It was hoped that this evil would be of short continuance;' but 'this

hope has been disappointed. The nuisance is widely extended, and increases daily. The Wesleyan ministers and societies are therefore informed that a series of tracts is in course of preparation, and will be published with all convenient speed, under the general title of 'Wesleyan Tracts for the Times,' unfolding Mr. Wesley's real views of ecclesiastical order, vindicating the ministers and people who at present bear his honoured name, and supplying an antidote to the ill-disguised popery which has ominously arisen in the heart of the protestant establishment of this country. This series of tracts will be published at stated intervals, of which due notice will be given. The attention of the Wesleyan connexion in general is respectfully invited to this announcement. The Wesleyan Tracts for the Times will not be an attack upon any body of Christians, but an earnest defence of an injured people against a race of intolerant and unscrupulous assailants.'

It appears that many Methodists have been very urgently pressed by this argument—'Mr. Wesley was a churchman—he discountenanced and condemned dissent. It is true that he apologized for his new establishment, by alleging the corruption of the old one; but he always urged his people to keep in the communion of the church. Yet modern Methodism has diverged in a variety of particulars from his principles, and has become either a separation from the church, or a schism in it.' Hence the force of the appeal to those who venerate Mr. Wesley, and profess to be guided by his sentiments. 'The church is vastly improved since his day; the pure gospel is extensively preached in its pulpits, and as he never contemplated the permanence of a sect, or the formation, on professed grounds of scriptural authority, of a dissentient church, in reference to the establishment, you ought now either to merge in the church of England, or harmonize your societies to it, so as to place them under the government and discipline of the hierarchy.'

Our readers will be curious to know how this argument is met by the *Connexion*, or what is the substance of their reply. It is in brief this—there is an anachronism in the appeal of the churchman to Mr. Wesley's opinions, which renders his argument invalid. It is shown that, though Mr. Wesley commenced his labours, and wrote some of his works, with a full belief in the scriptural authority of the church of England, and the perfect accuracy of all its principles, yet he subsequently altered his opinion, and though he never avowed himself a dissenter, yet he embraced the doctrine of presbyterian orders, believed in the divine institution of voluntary churches, their government and discipline by presbyters, and consequently left his connexion in the state of a

separate, regularly organized, and permanent religious community; and that, since his times, the Conference have merely carried on, and acted out, his last matured opinions respecting the church of Christ. Hence the Connexion now-a-days discovers no force in the requirement that they should merge in the church, because they perceive, in Mr. Wesley's later opinions, sufficient grounds to justify them in maintaining themselves independently of all connexion with, and all control from, the established church. This is all very well, and so far so good. Let Wesleyanism take its stand upon scriptural ground, in repudiating the doctrine of episcopal ordination, as essential to the validity of orders; let it maintain scriptural authority for government and discipline by presbyters; let it assert the scriptural right to assemble its people, and form them into churches, or a church, or societies, or a connexion, or whatever else they please to call them; and, in all this, let it be conceded that they are but acting in strict conformity with Mr. Wesley's last views and directions, they have the most perfect and indisputable right to do so; and, with the Bible in their hands, they are assuredly proof against all the assaults of the 'intolerant and unscrupulous assailants,' whom they profess to meet in these tracts.

But is this all? No; certain important inferences follow. The churchman retorts—you have hereby become dissenters; you have done the very thing, committed the very act, which you know full well Mr. Wesley deprecated and forbad. What is the reply which these tracts furnish to this argument? We must give it in the words of the writers:—

'The Wesleyan Methodists are not dissenters, *in the ordinary sense and application of that term;* for they do not dissent from the principle of a national ecclesiastical establishment, which derives a measure of protection and support from its union with the state, nor do they dissent from the doctrine and general formularies of the church of England; and they are not schismatics *in* the church, for this plain reason, that, to a considerable extent and degree, they are separated from the church. They would not affect names which mark parties and distinctions, but they cannot entirely avoid using them; and they are satisfied with the one that has descended to them, indulging the hope, at the same time, of that better day when every sectarian distinction shall cease, and all Christ's disciples shall be one in mind, in heart, and in name. They are *not*, then, *dissenters from the church of England, in the customary use of that expression;* and they are *not* SCHISMATICS *in the church of England;* but they *are* WESLEYAN METHODISTS.'—Tract No. 2, p. 10.

Again we find in the selfsame tract—

'Some one may be ready to ask, WHAT, THEN, IS WESLEYAN METHODISM? It must be a strange anomaly. If it is neither schism, nor schismatical separation, in what light shall we regard it? Our answer, which we would make with all humility and gratitude, is this, that singular and even anomalous as the present position of Wesleyan Methodism may be, it is doubtless, in itself, *the fruit of an extraordinary visitation and work of God.* To this our thoughts cannot fail to advert, when we have occasion to speak of the validity of its ministerial orders, and of its other claims as a part of the universal church of Christ.'

On reading this remarkable passage we opened our eyes, and rubbed our spectacles, and read it again and again, asking ourselves at the same time what can the writer or writers possibly intend by ascribing Methodism, when they *have occasion to speak of its ministerial orders,* to an extraordinary visitation and work of God? Do they mean to say that its distinctive principles are the result or fruit of a new revelation, thereby designing to remove it beyond the reach of the common revelation and common test? It is confessedly not church-of-Englandism; it is not dissent from the church of England, which it would seem to be, by asserting the validity of orders which the church denies, and the authority of voluntary societies, which that church repudiates; but it is '*the fruit of an extraordinary visitation and work of God.*' It does not attempt to dispute the validity of church-of-England ordination; it does not dissent from the doctrine of an establishment of Christianity by the state—it even approves of it, as lawful and desirable—and yet it very modestly sets up an independent hierarchy, seeking no such thing as support from the state; but after it has constituted a priesthood, not episcopally ordained, and a church or churches, not conformed to the pattern of the established church, it again very modestly tells the world, 'this Methodism of ours is the very best and most perfect, and most strictly apostolic church in Christendom. To be sure it is not, in its platform, episcopacy, and it is not dissent from episcopacy; for dissent from episcopacy we hold, with Mr. Wesley, to be a very abominable thing, and we never will allow ourselves to be guilty of it. We have something among us much better than either episcopacy or dissent.' It is indeed neither the one nor the other, for it is '*the fruit of an extraordinary visitation and work of God.*' This is the only rule by which these tracts direct us to judge of Methodism. Now so far as we have been able to pry into the genuine sense, the obvious intention of this singularly *humble* statement, it seems to affirm nothing less than the superior excellence and authority of Methodism over established episcopacy, and over every form of church government that ranks

under the comprehensive epithet of *dissent*, while it assigns a sufficiently ambitious reason for the preference. We allow that it would have been possible to put a different interpretation upon the words, had they been used in a different connexion, and for a different purpose; but since they are here employed as a reason to show why the Wesleyans are neither churchmen nor dissenters, they appear to us to be of no force, unless they are intended to annul the grounds of the churchman's appeal to them to submit to episcopal authority, and at the same time to set aside the dissenter's argument with them, that they ought to account themselves dissenters of some sort, because they repudiate episcopal ordination, and practically reject the alliance of the state. Hence it is alleged that Wesleyan Methodism does not conform itself to the establishment, because it originates in *an extraordinary visitation and work of God!* and it will not allow itself to assume the character of dissent from that church, for the very same reason. If this does not signify that Methodism claims to be a new dispensation, originating in a new revelation, we cannot understand either its meaning or its pertinence to the case in hand.

Will our readers have the goodness to observe the select phraseology with which this astounding announcement is made? 'Our answer, which we would make with all HUMILITY and GRATITUDE, is this—that *singular*, and even *anomalous*, as the present position of Wesleyan Methodism may be, it is, DOUBTLESS, in itself, *the fruit of an extraordinary visitation and work of God*.' The definition is placed in italics to arrest attention, and it will no doubt receive, both from churchmen and dissenters, the attention it deserves.

This is, to be sure, a very short and easy way of deciding the controversy. It was intended to stop the mouth of the churchman, who believes in extraordinary works and visitations of God; and it equally aims to silence the dissenter, who wishes to view the Wesleyan as placed in the same category with himself. But then, if Wesleyan Methodism disdains to conform itself to episcopal discipline, because it is the fruit of an extraordinary visitation of God, and yet could not for a moment think of dissenting from that episcopacy and that establishment, because both are scriptural and right; and, if in the next place it insists that its own platform of church principles shall be considered the fruit of *this extraordinary visitation and work of God*, exempt consequently from the common test, the old rules and principles of the written Scriptures, it must prepare itself to defend rather more fully than has yet been done, or is likely to be done by twopenny tracts, this new and extraordinary claim. We have

not yet seen any reason to induce us to submit to this modern dispensation, and from the specimens, proofs, and arguments, furnished by these tracts, we do not anticipate the speedy conversion either of the dissenting sects, or of the sects of clergy, Puseyite, evangelical, or otherwise.

It is a very serious matter which these gentlemen of the Conference have now before them, and we cannot but admonish them to be upon their guard as to the consequences, both to themselves and the cause of genuine Christianity, of placing their church-system upon ground which seems to remove it from the law and the testimony, and to claim for it a special foundation of its own. Surely it was in an evil hour, a dire exigency of argument, that the thought occurred of pleading a special or extraordinary visitation of God. Nothing short of the same evidences as sustained the mission of apostles, and those to the utmost fulness, can adequately support this novel, this bold claim. From all such pretensions, we think, they ought to shrink with shame and horror. Churchmen and dissenters will equally demand the proof of inspiration, before they can admit the claim, or agree to concede to Methodism that superiority which, if true, and founded as alleged, ought immediately to supersede all other forms and systems of church-government: for one that is *the fruit of a special visitation and work of God*, so recent as the times of Wesley, can be nothing short of an improved edition of the New Testament, or, to say the least, an authoritative interpretation which decides at once all questions of ordination, government, and discipline. Wesleyan Methodism is hereby affirmed to be God's last visitation to his distracted church! Where are the proofs?

We presume that the writer would deny that such is the necessary sense of his words, and protest that we have perverted his meaning in thus understanding them. We feel perfectly satisfied that he should retract them, or explain them in any other sense he may think proper; but if he refuses this sense, then of what avail is any other to the case before us? If he did not mean to exempt his system from the common test of Scripture, by this averment, then it was his province to have proved from Scripture that Methodism was at least equally founded in divine authority, or had as good a right to plead scripture sanction as either established episcopacy, or any of the forms of dissent. But it was obvious that this procedure must have necessitated one of two inferences—that his system either agreed with or differed from churchism — both which conclusions it was obviously necessary, and previously determined, to avoid. If, on scriptural principle, Methodism rejects episcopacy, in any material point, it

becomes dissent; if it admits dissent from the courted and flattered establishment, it clearly departs from the verbal standard and venerated pattern of its founder; so to avoid, or at least to appear to avoid, both these alternatives, it is made a rule to itself, by setting up for it a special claim, originating in an extraordinary *visitation and work of God*, a prerogative which at once enables it to overleap the 'swamps of dissent,' and place itself beyond the reach of the crosier, which is seeking to overawe it. But deprive the words of this sense, and let them signify nothing more than the happy revival of godliness under Methodism, in the conversion of souls, then they are neither a definition nor a defence of the platform of Methodism, as a church system, but simply an assertion of the divine influence, accompanying, in an extraordinary degree, the efforts and labours of Methodists; and must consequently leave the system itself to work out its vindication in the best way its advocates may, from the common repository of inspired instruction. Then would come the very exigency which the writers of the tracts sought to avoid—the dilemma to which the church-writers have reduced them—and from which, for our own part, we cannot see how they are to escape; for Methodism, if it defends itself by an appeal to the common standards to which all parties refer, must either agree with, or differ from, the established church of these realms. If its advocates assent to the complete scriptural authority of diocesan episcopacy, then comes, by way of awkward consequence, the sin of maintaining an unjustifiable schism, in continuing in a state of insubordination; if, on the other hand, it considerately impugns such episcopacy, it then inevitably sets up a standard of dissent, and becomes confessedly what its founder laboured to prevent its becoming. These are very disagreeable alternatives to men who have always piqued themselves upon observing punctually, and with deferential homage, the judgment of their master. It was a tempting occasion to evade both horns of the dilemma, by asserting that an extraordinary dispensation of grace was given to Mr. Wesley; but alas! they have aspired at a pinnacle too high for men of such humility, as they tell us they are, and the sooner they descend the better, for the dizzy height has already made their brains swim, and will, ere long, betray them into a disgraceful fall.

Certainly it was in an evil hour they were tempted to imitate the tractarians of Oxford, and he was a luckless wight who ambitiously undertook to prove that they were neither schismatics in the church nor dissenters from it.

Let us take another specimen from this master of the Wesleyan Israel:—

'Some have loved to plead that the Wesleyan Methodists must either be dissenters *from* the church of England, or schismatics *in* it. When able men touch upon this notion, and signify their approval of it, they certainly fall into an inadvertency, which was scarcely to be expected in their case; they do not observe the fallacy which lurks in the indeterminate and ambiguous name, *dissenter*.'

At this point we really expected, from this censor of the *able men* who have fallen into so glaring an inadvertency, a complete masterpiece of dialectical skill. We prepared ourselves for a piece of ratiocination which should have deterred the sons of Oxford and Cambridge from ever daring again to risk their character as logicians, in repeating such a fallacious proposition as that ascribed to the *able men*, or *approved by them*. Will any man venture again to repeat the proposition, 'Wesleyan Methodists must either be schismatics *in* the church of England, or dissenters *from* it'? This writer has affirmed that the ambiguous and indeterminate name contains a fallacy; and in proof of this assertion, he adds, that '*in the ordinary sense* and application of that term' (dissenter), 'the Wesleyan Methodists are not dissenters.' But where is the fallacy? A *fallacy* in a *name must* consist simply in its being false in any given application. The term dissenter is perfectly clear and limited and unambiguous in itself. It merely expresses a negative in relation to something understood. It does not define the degree, nor the particular point of disagreement. It does not pretend to state the reasons for differing from the supposed proposition; it does not say what kind of a dissenter he is, but merely that he does not agree to something implied and understood. Well then, where is the fallacy? The writer affirms a fallacy, but does not attempt to point it out. He merely alleges that the Wesleyans are not dissenters *in the ordinary sense of that term*. Granted: but the term is not necessarily limited to the sects that are usually called dissenters. Twenty other new sects might arise, and if they refused to conform to the church of England, they would be just as logically included under this universal negative, as any of those sects to which it is ordinarily applied. In fact, the term is clearly comprehensive of every party and every person who is not *bona fide* a churchman. The term dissenter applies to a quaker, a presbyterian, an independent, an antipædobaptist, a Swedenborgian, a Plymouth brother, and everybody else who, being a protestant in his religious opinions and practice, differs from the church of England. Wherein, then, consists the fallacy in this name, this hated, ambiguous word, *dissenter*? The learned author of the tract has failed, indeed he has not attempted, to show. He could not do it. He has merely stated that, *in its*

ordinary application, it does not belong to Wesleyan methodists. They are neither dissenters from the church, because, observe, they are not *such* dissenters from the church as some other people, nor are they schismatics in the church. This is very much like saying—they are neither out of the church of England nor in it. Their situation is like Mahomet's tomb; it is neither in heaven nor on earth, but somewhere between the two. But the thing is impossible. They are either churchmen or dissenters. We should rather suspect that the clerical writers who have enforced the proposition, which this author professes to prove fallacious, are logicians enough to detect *his* fallacies, his attempt to obscure the proposition, and his retreat, equally perilous and presumptuous, into the assumption of a new and extraordinary visitation of God, which we have before exposed; and they will certainly not fail to insist upon the proposition, and to make it ring in the ears of the Methodists, till they take one alternative or the other, '*you are either schismatics in the church of England, or dissenters from it.* Your pretence to a special visitation and work of God, distinct from the New Testament, as your authority, is open rebellion against Christ and his apostles. It is a blasphemy for which you deserve stoning, unless you repent. And your own tracts will now be swift witnesses against you, that you are, all of you, either in the one or the other of those positions which you have denied.' Here, for instance, is one whole tract (No. 4) devoted to the proof that *Wesleyan ministers are true ministers of Christ.* But how does the writer prove it? By showing that they possess scriptural qualifications, and then by openly denying and setting aside the doctrine of the church of England, that there are three orders of clergy in the church of Christ; next, by asserting the validity of ordination by presbyters, to the denial of the necessity, at least, of episcopal ordination, and by repudiating with scorn the dogma of apostolical succession. Excellent! But what inference follows? This is literally dissenterism. The man who asserts that there are not, by divine institution, three orders in the ministry of the church of Christ, IS A DISSENTER from the church of England. The man who denies or refuses assent to the proposition, that episcopal ordination is essential to the right and orderly ministration of the word and ordinances, IS A DISSENTER, because in this he differs from the church of England. He may not be an independent, a baptist, a unitarian dissenter; but he is, to all intents and purposes, *a dissenter after his own fashion.* It is mere dishonesty, shuffling, cowardice, unmanly evasion, to deny that he is a dissenter. No clearer proof could be supplied of dissenterism than is contained in these tracts, and yet it is

affirmed that '*Wesleyans are neither schismatics in the church, nor dissenters from it.*' They set up a distinct community; they separate from the parish church; they defend the validity of presbyterian ordination; they prefer their own system of church discipline to any other; they ridicule the notion of apostolical succession; they celebrate the simple rites of Christianity according to their own notions of apostolic precedent; they disown baptismal regeneration, and abolish the rite of confirmation; they repudiate the divine authority of diocesan episcopacy, assert the parity of all true ministers of Christ, employ lay preachers, and have practically preferred a voluntary system of church-support to a state-establishment; they have licensed their places of worship and their ministers, as not of the church by law established; they teach their people nonconformity to the establishment, and conformity to the laws of conference, and then they have the *ineffable modesty*, the *Christian frankness and simplicity*, to stand forth before the world with this announcement, 'We are neither schismatics in the church, nor dissenters from it, but just Wesleyan methodists, who claim as authority for our system, *an extraordinary visitation and work of God;* therefore touch us not, judge us not. You will be guilty of a fallacy if you call us dissenters of any sort; and you will be chargeable with falsehood if you describe us as schismatics in the church.'

The Wesleyan body may plead that they are not dissenters, because they evince no hostility to the church, thinking it unseemly to make war upon such near neighbours; yet, in this respect, many others who do not shrink from the name of dissenter are like them; and it does not follow, that to be a dissenter a man must maintain controversy, and evince an uncharitable spirit. But the fact, now obvious to all the world, is, that these tracts, published in the name of the body, do make open war upon *church-of-England principles.* The Puseyite sect or party, now by far the most numerous and powerful, have, in point of numbers and consistency, a just right to consider themselves as the church of England. Their opinions and interpretations are most in conformity with the entire system. Now the Wesleyan tracts, although asserting that they *will not be an attack upon any body of Christians,* are a direct attack upon these Puseyite clergy. Nor is this all. They contain denials, as we have already shown, of several cherished and unquestionable principles, maintained alike by all the formularies and all the clergy of the church of England. The body of Wesleyan Methodists are therefore now written down by their own pen, DISSENTERS. They may deny and reclaim as loudly and as much as they please: they have both verbally and practically

defended dissent, both from church-of-England Puseyism and church-of-England evangelism and episcopacy; and their pretended approbation of state alliance will go for nothing while they practise voluntaryism, and reject all the gracious overtures and wooing entreaties to merge their connexion in the establishment. They are *dissenters* by their own showing; and all attempts to induce them to return to the diocesan fold will be unavailing.

Mr. Hodgson has addressed to them a very temperate, very kind, and yet cutting appeal. And, if at least, they really loved the church system more than their own anomalous position, and believed that system strictly apostolic, they would renounce the pretence of an extraordinary visitation and work of God, and at once fall into the ranks of the hierarchy. But they will not do this. They never have for a moment seriously entertained the idea. They intend to remain Wesleyan Methodists—that is, dissenters, both theoretically and practically, until the millennium, or till there shall be another *extraordinary visitation and work of God.* The clergy who choose to attack them, upon the ground of their pretended approbation of the church of England, have had, and will still have, the better side of the argument. It must be unjustifiable to continue a separation which alleges no grounds of disagreement upon either principle or practice. The law of Christian union is violated by such a separation, and pronounces it a schismatical separation. The Wesleyan who can find nothing unscriptural, but all the contrary, in the system of the established church, ought to break through all his early association, and show that the name of Jesus Christ and his apostles has more authority with him than the name and opinions of John Wesley. The man who objects to church principles, and conscientiously practises others, is a dissenter.

It is to be expected that the assailants of Methodism from the side of the church will be increasingly urgent and increasingly successful. We have seen nothing in these tracts which is adapted to counteract the inroads of church-of-England zeal. Certainly, the attempt to defend themselves from the charge of schism or of dissent is a conspicuous failure. A more complete piece of sophistry and special pleading has rarely seen the light. It aspires to be equally learned, critical, and logical, and is altogether one of the least clear, and most inefficient of the series. The writers are, no doubt, able men in their way, and devoted admirers of Wesleyan Methodism; but they have egregiously committed themselves in supposing that they were called to write controversial tracts for the times. There may be fifty other things which they may do with ability and success, but their

vocation is evidently not in the controversial line. We do not perceive how they will ever again venture with seriousness to proclaim their adherence to the church of England, after the exposition of their opinions which these tracts supply. Every Puseyite may point to the Tract No. 3, entitled, 'Apostolical Succession,' and say, have you not denounced the principles of the church? Every evangelical clergyman may point to the Tract No. 4, entitled, 'Wesleyan ministers true ministers of Christ,' and say, have you not written against the three orders of bishops, priests, and deacons? Is not the whole conference committed to a species of dissent? Fie upon you! You are endeavouring to write down our church, as much as any dissenters in the land, and you are as determined in your separation, and as ready to defend it by argument, as any sectarian. You are as clearly guilty of setting up a peculiar church-system as any of the sects, and you claim as full a measure of divine authority for your doctrine, discipline, and ministry, as ourselves. You affirm as full a validity in your administration of sacraments as we do in ours. And yet you have the effrontery to tell us and all the world, that you are *neither schismatics in the church, nor dissenters from it.* Now the only difference we can discern between you and others, is in the frankness with which others admit their dissent, and the flattery, equivocation, and pretended agreement with which you palliate yours. But, henceforth, your dissent is branded upon you, absolutely burnt in by your own hands. Every churchman will view you, cannot but view you, in spite of your sophistical argumentation, mere downright dissenters from church-of-England principles.

For our own parts we cannot but hail with satisfaction this authorized movement of the connexion. Though we deem it a very awkward and perilous thing for a whole body or denomination to engage in controversy, yet the very anomalous situation which methodism has long occupied, which is frankly admitted in these tracts, renders the effort now making to ascertain the real position of this important and useful society of Christians, highly desirable. We trust the series of Tracts will be continued, and that they will afford, from head quarters, a complete development of Methodism, and point out fully its hostility to modern churchism. The position taken by the Tracts, though accompanied with some serious trips, will prove serviceable to the grand principles of the reformation, and may materially contribute to reinforce the band of Christian advocates, who are gathering from all sides to withstand the common enemy. In this service we hail the volunteered, though somewhat limping assistance of Methodism. It will improve as it advances by its

arguments against Puseyism. It will honour itself, and assist the common cause, by asserting and arguing out the great protestant principle—the Bible, the Bible only! But it must either be content henceforth to wear the common badge of dissenterism, or its banner must exhibit a Wesley-face represented as a Janus, with one side wistfully looking up at a *mitre*, but the other wearing a presbyterian cap. We confidently predict that the connexion can no longer carry a double faced standard, nor display an equivocal motto. Reluctant as the men may be to assume the position of hostility to churchism, yet they have at length been driven to it by 'intolerant and unscrupulous assailants,' and by the defections that have taken place. The Rubicon is now passed by the chiefs, and the dread of being called dissenters must give place to that zeal for the gospel and deference to the word of God, which unquestionably pervade the body. If the connexion could but once be brought to realize the position which they obviously do occupy; could they alike resolve to cast off their false shame and their worldly policy, to open their eyes to their own verbal and practical condemnation of the church—a church to which they show no deference but on paper, and from which they can expect to receive no quarter—could they, in one word, but be brought to confess the honest truth, and submit to be called Methodist dissenters, which they really are, they would then secure the respect of all other denominations, as men of clear and unequivocal principle; they would escape from all the embarrassing nets which they are continually spreading for their own feet, and go forth against Puseyism and churchism with all their fatal corruptions, 'fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners.' But at present, their banner, if they consider themselves as having one, must be an *enigma*, the attempt to expound which has confounded and overthrown the very Œdipus of the party.

Art. VI. *Russia and the Russians in* 1842. By J. G. Kohl, Esq. Vol. II. London: Colburn.

We lose no time in introducing the second volume of this work to our readers. Its general character, both as it respects the value and the interest of the information which it contains, closely resembles that of its predecessor, and together they constitute a work which will render the English public more familiar with the character, institutions, social condition, and industrial habits of the Russian people than anything previously within

their reach. The comparatively recent development and rapid growth of Russian power, the vast extent of the empire, the multifarious character of its tribes, its warlike tendencies and obvious spirit of aggression, the part it has already acted in European politics, and the influence it is destined to exert over the councils and destinies of its neighbours,—all combine to fix upon this Northern Colossus the attentive eye of Europe, and to attach immense importance to a right estimate of the character of its people and the policy of its rulers. These considerations have led us to peruse M. Kohl's work with more than ordinary interest, and we shall be glad to find that it obtains—as it undoubtedly will—extensive circulation amongst our countrymen.

The present volume is divided into thirteen chapters, each of which contains much information that will be novel to the English reader. The first, entitled *Arts, Manufactures, Industry*, ranges over a variety of subjects of considerable importance and interest. By means of its situation and privileges, Petersburg monopolizes nearly the whole of the foreign trade of the empire, being 'almost the only port from which exclusively all Russia is supplied with jewellery, watches, clothing, wines, woollens, silks, cottons,' &c. This trade is in the hands of foreigners, who have accumulated in the capital vast stores of the productions of Western Europe. Petersburg is, in fact, the grand magazine whence other parts of the empire obtain their supply of foreign manufactures.

'Petersburg is the head-quarters of a most remarkable trade in productions of art, carried on by foreigners, and extending from town to town to the remotest places of the empire, to Charkoff, Woronesch, Astrachan, Tobolsk, and Kaluga; for which they have founded a distinct little colony in almost every town in Russia, establishing themselves in general in the main street of each.

'These provincial colonies of foreign artists, artisans, and dealers in productions of the arts, planted all over the empire, that is, throughout one-half of Europe and one-half of Asia, are a phenomenon well worthy of the attention of every traveller. By means of the commodities in which they deal, these persons acquire peculiar consequence and an extensive sphere of action; they promote the cause of civilization not merely as tradesmen, but in many other ways; they are admitted into companies which among us would be deemed far above them, and, as mere watchmakers, tailors, jewellers, or woollen-drapers, they frequently possess an influence and an importance not to be derived from their businesses alone. As they all resemble one another in the most striking manner, even in the minutest traits and peculiarities; since not only the different branches of this inland trade in the productions of the arts are separated in the same way, and the shops are everywhere arranged in precisely the same manner; such and such commo-

dities always accompanying such and such others; but the same kind of persons are always found with the same goods, and these persons are universally of the same nation, have experienced the same fortunes in life, display the same virtues, and contract the same vices abroad: it may be worth while to collect the observations we have made upon this foreign industry in Petersburg, as they will serve at the same time to characterize the innumerable colonies in the other parts of the empire.'—pp. 2, 3.

Passing over a variety of topics we come to the following, in which our author's account of the gains of literature, and the proficiency attained in the typographical art, will probably surprise many of our readers. A vast portion of the Russian empire is yet in a state of semi-barbarism, but the elements of civilization are afloat, and under the fostering patronage of successive emperors, have extended their influence with astonishing rapidity over the upper classes of society.

'Among the many things that interest the foreigner in Petersburg, the booksellers' shops are certainly not the least important. Germans, French, and Russians here offer to the public the newest as well as the oldest fruits of their literature. Among the Germans the oldest, and indeed now somewhat antiquated, firms are those of Brieff and Gräfe, from whose shops issued most of the German and French works printed in Russia. Among the French booksellers, Pluchard was formerly the most eminent; but of the Russian, Smirdin is decidedly the first. It is astonishing what a rich assortment Russian literature has already furnished him, and not less so the extraordinary elegance with which books are now printed in his office. Perhaps at no time were books printed in Russia so vilely, on such wretched paper, with such abominable type, and such an utter want of taste and accuracy, as was not long ago almost universally the case, and as it is still here and there, in Germany. Since the beginning of the present century, such an extraordinary improvement has taken place in Russian typography, that you now meet here with works which will bear comparison with those of other countries. In the ordinary course, all Russian books are printed on stout paper, and with remarkably large type; but there are also editions in twelves and sixteens, which for neatness leave nothing to be desired.

'The advantage accruing to Russian literature from this improvement in outward appearance is not trifling; the Russian books printed by Smirdin may now show themselves boldly in the boudoirs of ladies of distinction, along with the elegant productions of Paris and London; and the time is past when a Russian noble had but here and there a Russian book standing in the dust on the lowest shelves of his almost exclusively French library. Russian books now fill completely the cases allotted to them. Not only the extent of the stock of many a retail bookseller of Petersburg and Moscow, exceeding in some in-

stances 100,000 volumes, but also the high prices paid to favourite authors, show the extraordinary increase which has recently taken place in the sale of Russian books. The following facts may serve for a standard. There are Russian authors who have already acquired by their pen estates comprehending several square [German] miles. There are persons of consequence who are paid from 5000 to 7000 rubles merely for lending their names to a favourite journal, and there are periodicals which have not fewer than 20,000 subscribers. The most extensive modern work, upon which a great number of hands are busily engaged, is the great, voluminous, Russian National Encyclopædia, the contributors to which are paid 100, 200 rubles, and more, per sheet, so that a very great circulation must be calculated upon. Russian literature is now strong enough to counterbalance the French in Russia, if not even to outweigh it here and there in the highest circles.'—pp. 33, 34.

We leave the second chapter of this volume, the twenty-second of the work, entitled *The Table and Cookery*, to such of our readers as are interested in culinary matters, and pass on to the next, which treats on the more important subject of education. Every spring witnesses the importation of a large number of Swiss, French, English, and German young ladies, who 'are destined to perform the functions of priestesses of Minerva in Russia, and to kindle and keep alive the fire of civilization in that country.' The number of governesses and private tutors in Petersburg is stated to be about six thousand, and the salaries paid them are considerable. On this latter point Kohl furnishes the following information:—

'The salaries which the Russians pay to private tutors are very high; they run in general from three to four thousand rubles, but some rise to six and even to ten thousand, especially when they wish to entice a person into inclement Siberia, or some other remote province. In general, when the engagement expires, an annuity is settled upon the teacher, or, what now begins to be more common, a round sum of from thirty to fifty thousand rubles is paid down to him at once. Even the French governesses receive salaries equal to those of professors in Germany; and they have rather risen than fallen, on account of the sparingness with which Russian passports are now granted. Such is the increasing demand for instructors, that extraordinary sums are paid even to natives.'—p. 74.

The nursemaids for young children, we are informed, are invariably English, who are reputed, much to their honour, to excel in the kindness and attention which such a post requires.

The Russian government, ever since the time of Peter the Great, has been distinguished by a zealous patronage of education. Academies, universities, gymnasiums, and popular schools

have sprung up, as if by magic, in all parts of the empire. So uniform has been the policy of the rulers, that the Russian schoolmaster has invariably followed the steps of the Russian soldier.

'In every country added by their arms to the empire, the Russians immediately make it their business to found schools after their fashion, aware, like the Romans, how mighty are the bonds in which one and the same language and education bind the members of a state together. Thus they have introduced their schools among the Tatars, the Fins, the Moldavians, and many other nations; thus they have even carried their method of instruction beyond the Caucasus, and applied it to the Armenians and the Grusinians; thus they have recently suppressed throughout all Poland the old schools of the country, and established others upon their own plan; thus, in the Baltic provinces, they have even entered the lists against the German scholastic system, though they originally took it for their model, and are striving to breathe into it their own spirit; and thus they are everywhere assiduously endeavouring, by means of their schools, to annihilate everything foreign, to frame every part of the state after their fashion, to russify it, after setting themselves up, from the frontiers of Germany to the extremity of Mongolia, to China and Japan, for champions of European culture modified in the Russian manner, and drawing numerous tribes and nations into the fermentative process of their civilization.'—pp. 80, 81.

From this state of things it might reasonably be concluded that the great bulk of the people must have made considerable progress in the elements of useful knowledge. There are, however, some drawbacks which must be taken into account before a correct estimate of their condition can be formed. There is no European nation, according to our author, which attaches such importance to mere externals, and is so little capable of appreciating the more substantial but less visible acquisitions of real science. This preference of the outward to the inward is apparent in their courts of justice, in their army, and even in their trades and commerce, 'where all the labels and the outside of their goods are elegant, and the arrangement brilliant, but the goods themselves worthless.' The same fact is observable in their collegiate institutions, the buildings, regulations, and examinations of which are admirable, while a discerning eye is not long in detecting a lamentable deficiency of all that constitutes the real value of education.

Next to the university, the *Pedagogic Institution*, the object of which is to train teachers, is most deserving of attention. It was founded in 1832, after the Polish revolution, enjoys almost all the rights and privileges of the university, is supported by the crown, and costs annually not less than 250,000 rubles.

'The institutions for the education of the female sex in Petersburg are almost as numerous as those for the male. At the head of them all must be placed the great institution of Smolna, in the convent of that name, to which we have already adverted. In this remarkable institution not fewer than eight hundred young females are brought up, taught French and German, and instructed in the fine arts and sciences. Most of them are of noble birth. The commoners occupy a different building, and have a different dress, different fare, and different attendance. This institution, together with those founded on the same principle in various government towns for the daughters of the inferior and poorer nobility, nearly correspond with the schools of cadets for the sons. When parents know not what to do at home with sons, they send them to the cadets, and daughters in like manner to the institutions, when they cannot educate them at home.

'All the wealthy Russians prefer domestic education for girls. The directresses of those institutions, and particularly of the Petersburg institution abovementioned, are commonly ladies of high rank, widows of generals, &c., for whom a suitable provision is made by the gift of such an office. They are mostly noble Livonian ladies of the German nation, and highly accomplished. The consequence of these ladies is not small, and they, who with us would be merely teachers, are here nearly equal in rank and importance to the governors of provinces.

'The institution of Smolna costs upward of 700,000 rubles per annum; thus nearly 1000 rubles are expended on the education of each of the young ladies—a sum for which something brilliant might be expected. It is true that whatever has been polished here shines not a little; but it is mere moonshine, light without warmth, which indeed possesses a certain charm, but is destitute of the vivifying, fructifying power so peculiarly desirable in this case, since most of these young ladies are destined as teachers and governesses, to sow the seeds of knowledge in other minds.

'For the rest, the Smolna Institution is perhaps unique, for nowhere else, we presume, are so many young buds of nobility, so much warm youthful blood circulating in female forms, to be found under one roof. The interesting stories occasionally communicated to the stranger out of the annals of the institution, would furnish matter for a separate book. Amazonian wars, ladies' revolutions, seraglio-intrigues—novels upon novels might be spun out of them. It is a pity that the young ladies appear but very seldom in public. They are kept shut up almost as close as in a convent. Only now and then, on high festivals, a long train of imperial carriages and six is seen drawing out of the gates of the convent, to give the pretty greenhouse-flowers an airing.'—pp. 92, 93.

The Russian servants constitute a numerous class, whose habits and condition reflect no very creditable light on the general state of the community. Personal slavery exists to a vast extent, and all the evils usually attendant on it follow in its train.

The great body of the people are in the condition of serfs, and are divided by their lords into two classes,—those who cultivate the land, and those (termed court-yard people) who are selected as domestic servants. Of the latter class, M. Kohl remarks:—

'These court-yard people have, as such, various immunities; they are exempted from agricultural labour and from military service. As they fare no better at court than at home, must find their own bread and kwas, and live for the rest upon the leavings of the lord's table, and as most of them are not supplied with any other clothes than what they wore on the paternal dunghill, such attendants cost, of course, but little, and the lords therefore take whole troops of stable-boys, stove-heaters, scullions, lamp-lighters, domestic couriers, house-maids, and table-deckers. These genuine old Russian retainers, who, with their bast shoes and sheep-skin pelisses, form a remarkable contrast with the palaces where they live with their lords, and where they occasionally sleep on the bench of the kitchen stove, or on the chairs or the floor of the rooms, without bed or chamber of their own, are found in all the country houses in the interior, and still seen also in many houses in Moscow and Petersburg, especially of the poorer sort. Many of these serfs who have been taken from the fields are employed in the performance of the more menial household duties; they are provided indeed with boots and a better kaftan, used for a time in the kitchen or stable, and then sent back again to the fields. In general, they continue not long in their new posts; and, upon the whole, they differ too little from the actual peasants to form a distinct class of society, and to separate themselves, under the name of servants, from the other serfs.'—pp. 95, 96.

A large section of the servants of Petersburg is composed of peasants and the younger sons of farmers, for whom the lords of the soil cannot find agricultural employment. These are dismissed to the capital to seek a livelihood for themselves, under an engagement to pay their lords a stipulated sum yearly. They are furnished with a passport to the following effect, and may be met with in the coffee-houses, manufactories, and private families of Petersburgh:—

'I dismiss this, my *krepostnoi tschelwek* (bondman), Jephim, on condition of his paying a yearly *obrok* of sixty (seventy, eighty, or more) rubles, to be sent to me half yearly, with liberty to go to all the cities and villages in the Russian empire, to seek his livelihood in any way whatever for so or so many years, till I shall think fit to recal him to my estate N., where he is registered.'

The number of servants kept in first-rate Russian establishments is astonishingly great; and, as there is happily a growing preference for free persons, the wages paid are very high. One

circumstance pertaining to them, mentioned by our author, has surprised us, as it probably will most of our readers, for whose information we transcribe it:—

'If anything in Petersburg excites the astonishment of foreigners, it is the extraordinary fondness for reading now observable among the Russian servants. Most of the antechambers of Petersburg grandees, where part of the servants are constantly assembled, look like absolute reading-rooms, all of them being engaged with some book or other, with the exception of those who are playing at backgammon, the favourite game of the Russians, who take the same delight, and display the same skill in it, whether as sailors upon the ocean, as exiles in Siberia, as soldiers on the field of battle, or as domestics in the antechamber. It is no uncommon thing to find six or eight of them in different corners of the room, absorbed in their books; and if this sign of a growing desire of knowledge astonishes the foreigner, who expected to find here nothing but barbarism, sloth, and ignorance, he will be still more astonished if he takes the trouble to inquire the subjects of the works which they are reading. A translation of Bourrienne's Memoirs, Karamsin's History of Russia, Kruilow's Fables, Prince Odojewsky's Tales, Bantysch Kamensky's History of Little Russia, Polewoy's Sketch of Universal History, a translation of the Æneid—such are the titles that present themselves to the inquirer. Enough is now written in Russia to make the diligent reader acquainted with everything new that is worth knowing, and the book-market and circulating libraries in Petersburg distribute it promptly among the people. In the provinces the case is different, and there you meet with real touching instances of literary propensities. I knew an old house-steward, who, in his leisure hours, had learned Kruilow's Fables by heart, and read Karamsin's History six times, because he could not procure any other book. Another servant had studied a voluminous system of mathematics, geometry, and trigonometry, and likewise a complete system of algebra, and drawn most of the figures on scraps of paper. All that is written among us concerning Napoleon is immediately translated into Russian, and greedily devoured by all classes, but especially in the servants' halls in Petersburg. When you examine the book-shelves of these people in their dark rooms, you are surprised to find what the activity of their inquisitive minds has led them to bring together. Part of a Bible lies beside a translation of the Iliad, and an *Asbuka* (A B C book) published by the Holy Synod by a work of Voltaire's. The very passport of the Russian servants shews that in one branch of knowledge they surpass those of other countries, for, after the usual particulars concerning eyes, mouth, beard, &c., there comes this intimation, 'He speaks languages,' and immediately afterwards, Russian, French, German, English, and Turkish, are specified.'—pp. 115—117.

The amusements of the capital are sketched with much vivacity and life in Chapter XXV., which is entitled, '*The Butter-*

week.' Easter is the chief festival of the Greek-Russian church. It commences in the middle of the night before Easter Sunday, and is preceded by a seven weeks' fast, which again is introduced by eight days' feasting, called by the Russians, Masslänitza, Butter-week. This season of indulgence ' may be said to contain the quintessence of all the Russian festivities for the whole year. And with the exception of Easter week, there is no week in the year that affords a Petersburger so much earthly pleasure as this.' The amusement most popular amongst the Russians is that of the ice-hills, which are constructed by a narrow stage elevated about thirty or forty feet, with a small gallery at the top. To this there is an ascent on one side by wooden steps, and on the other, there is an inclined plane, very steep at first, but gradually sloping towards the ground. The surface of this plane, which is composed of the trunks of trees, is covered with square blocks of ice, over which water is occasionally poured, in order, by its freezing, to cement the blocks, and to increase the smoothness of the slope. The following is M. Kohl's account of the entertainment furnished by these novel constructions:—

' The barriers which bound their courses are always lined with a dense crowd of spectators, while the courses themselves exhibit no lack of actors. At the foot of the scaffold you find a number of men with small low sledges, without backs, which, while tendering the use of them, they almost thrust under the feet of passengers. The moment you give one of them an approving nod, he runs up the steps with you, and you arrange yourself on the narrow little sledge as well as you can. The conductor springs up behind, and away darts the sledge down the descent. The impetus which it receives from the steepness of the slope at first operates so powerfully, that you would fly nobody knows how far, if the end of the course were not strewed with sand, which diminishes the rapidity of the sledge, and totally stops its movement. The conductor has thick leather gloves on his hands, which he suffers to glide over the surface of the ice, giving a thrust now on one side, then on another, to guide the sledge and to correct little irregularities. About noon, when the concourse is very great, one sledge flies hissing after another. Petty accidents cannot always be avoided; serious ones rarely happen; and the former, while they cause but little vexation to a single individual, are extremely amusing to thousands. The sledge, laden with the corpulent wife of some Russian tradesman, shoots down the course somewhat more rapidly than that in which a slender *élégant* seats himself merely for experiment's sake. Highly comic scenes are often occurring, especially at the end of the course in the sand, where perhaps a young woman, who has made the trip for the first time in her life, and is half dead with fright, cannot pick herself up before a smart fellow, with outstretched legs, comes sailing down upon her, and thus you sometimes see a whole

knot of people and sledges tumbling about in the snow at once. The exhibition of equilibristic tricks during the descent is forbidden; and, on account of the danger attending the amusement, the police take care that none but the ordinary sledges and the appointed conductors shall be employed. Occasionally, however, daring fellows, who are not concerned about their necks, contrive to elude their vigilance, and to perform some trick or other. One will lie down at full length on the sledge, shut his eyes, and, with folded arms, plunge down the descent with as much indifference as if he were asleep. Another lies down head foremost, making a face at the spectators, and launches himself off as though tumbling over head and heels. Some even venture to skait down, and, flying like arrows to the end of the course, they are lost among the crowd long before the police can overtake them. Of course this is not a genteel amusement. With the exception of the ladies, however, who feel themselves above the fat Russian tradesmen's wives, everybody tries it for once in a way, particularly the English—but what on earth is there that they leave untried ?'—pp. 136—138.

The seven weeks' fast which follows the Butter-week, is, of course, a wearisome time to the Russians, who look forward to its termination with a full resolve to compensate themselves for the abstinence it has imposed. 'In the last days of the fast, expectation is excited,' we are informed, 'to the utmost. . . . . People are completely tired and exhausted with the incessant kneeling, and the long church services. Many have not eaten a morsel for the last three days, and are half famished.' The churches are perambulated during the whole of Saturday evening, though the priests are not seen until midnight. This has given rise to a singular custom, which will excite the pious horror of some of our sticklers for ecclesiastical etiquette. It is somewhat instructive to observe, that in a church so deeply sunk in superstition as the Russian Greek church confessedly is, there should yet remain vestiges of primitive times which are unknown in the worship of our hierarchy. We commend to the serious attention of our church readers, if, indeed, we have such, M. Kohl's remarks towards the close of the following extract:—

'It is customary for one of the public to take upon himself the task of reading out of the gospels. For this purpose a desk, with a Bible, is placed in the middle of the church. Persons of the lowest class, who can spell Sclavonic, stand forth, and with a burning taper in their hands, light themselves to read out of the Bible to all those who are willing to listen, till others offer to relieve them. I must confess that, with the exception of the delightful singing, this reading on Easter-eve was to me the most impressive and edifying practice of the Russian church.

'When, on Easter-eve, 1837, I made my tour of the churches of the capital, I found in the Spass-Preobrajenskoi church an old scarred

soldier in his gray frock standing at the desk, with his wax taper in his hand, reading the gospel aloud. Around him were gathered a great number of children, who, with eyes steadfastly fixed upon him, listened with folded hands as devoutly as the adults. In the Panteleimon church I found an equally pious circle around the solitary wax taper of a long-bearded venerable old man, who took great pains to rehearse, with feeble and tremulous voice, but with great earnestness and devotion, the history of the sufferings of the Redeemer. Old women, young damsels, children, and youths, were standing in the most attentive groups around him, and neither he nor they took the least notice of the numbers continually going to and fro to kiss the corpse.

'I could not tire of witnessing these picturesque scenes, and found them in all the churches addressing themselves with equal force to the heart. It is a pity that the priests do not oftener relinquish the book, and suffer the word of God to be dispensed by the simple members of the congregation; true piety could only be a gainer by it. All the priests without exception attain, by the daily repetition of the same things, a great mechanical fluency, with which they then perform divine service; and the little in that service which might touch their own hearts is recited with such indifference as to lose all its effect. On the other hand, the interest of the voluntary reader in the subject which he is reading of is manifest and unaffected; and the sentiments and precepts which he recites go immediately to the heart since they come immediately from the heart. Even the defects of the reader, so far from disturbing devotion, serve on the contrary to promote it. When he pauses at a word, moves his eye and his light closer to the book, his auditors listen with increased attention; and when the right word is pronounced with stronger emphasis, it never fails to make a proportionate impression.'—pp. 170—172.

As midnight approaches, the churches gradually become crowded. Mass is read faintly and slowly, till the critical moment arrives, when the scene instantly assumes a totally different character. 'The fast is banished as if by magic, and Easter Sunday suddenly bursts forth from amidst the darkness like an Apollo.' M. Kohl tells us that it would be difficult to relate all the extraordinary things which are to be heard and seen as soon as the hour of midnight arrives. We can make room only for his account of one of these national customs, which will appear sufficiently singular to our reserved and prudent countrymen.

'In the first place, all the members of a family without exception kiss one another. Supposing a family consists of ten members only, this gives ninety kisses apiece for that family alone. Besides this, all acquaintances, the first time they meet in the Easter-week, kiss each other. This designation comprehends not merely intimate acquaintances: persons to whom you have spoken but a few times would be grievously offended, if, on first meeting, you hesitated to give and

receive the kiss and the cordial embrace. 'The devil fetch thee, Maxim!' I once heard an old woman call out to a young fellow; 'canst thou not say to me, 'Christ is risen,' and kiss me?'

'If we assume, then, that every person in Petersburg has upon an average a hundred near and distant acquaintances, which is a very moderate calculation, the result for the 500,000 inhabitants of Petersburg alone is a total of fifty million Easter embraces. But consider what a prodigious business is done by certain individuals in this article. In the army, every general of a corps (of 60,000 men) must kiss all its officers, and in like manner, every commander of a regiment, all the officers of that regiment, and a select number of the privates to boot. The captain kisses individually all the soldiers of his company, who are mustered for this special purpose. The same system prevails in the civil department: the head must kiss all his underlings, who hasten to visit him on Easter Sunday morning in their state uniforms. Hence, owing to the numerous establishments of the public offices, the chief may often need no small quantity of lip-salve during the following days; for, as far as I have observed, all these kisses are not such make-believe, superficial ones as actors, for instance, give one another, but downright hearty smacks. Even a subordinate person has plenty to do in this way; for he has often a dozen grades of immediate and mediate superiors; but, as for these latter, from whom long trains of subordinates are incessantly departing, they have scarcely time to breathe. Of course, on this, as on every other occasion, the most duties and the most business devolve upon the emperor. Only consider his large family, his prodigious court and establishment, the numberless visitors that he receives on Easter Sunday morning, all the people of distinction with whom he is personally acquainted, and whom he honours with a bow when he casually meets them! But this is not all. The meanest sentry in his palace, whom he passes at Easter, he salutes with a kiss and '*Christohs woskress.*' Nay, upon the Parade on Easter Sunday, he kisses the whole assembled corps of officers, and a not inconsiderable number of the privates, who, selected for the purpose, step out of the ranks.

'All these kisses, being given heartily and cordially, amidst laughing and shaking of hands, as though people had not met for a long time, and were expressing their mutual congratulations on seeing one another so brisk and so cheerful after a long period of severe affliction, it may easily be conceived what joyous scenes fill the streets and the houses. '*Christohs woskress, Jéfim Stepánowitsch!*' (Christ is risen, Eupheme Stephen's son!) cries one bushy beard to another, while yet at some distance—'*Woistwenno woskress*' (he is risen, indeed). Grasping each other's hand, they kiss, and *padjóm w'kabak, brat!* (let us have something to drink, brother!) is the next thing, and away they go to the public-house for some brandy, which is now poured forth as profusely as water by the limpid springs in Mohammed's paradise. Among the higher classes, much the same thing occurs, only with them it is 'Allons dejeuner.'—pp. 179—181.

Unhappily, there are other and more criminal habits prevalent during Easter. Intoxication is one of these, which, however, from some peculiarity in the temperament of the Russians, is productive of less evil amongst them than amongst most other people. The following is our author's account of this matter:—

'That all the Easter scenes are not of this mild and cheerful complexion may be inferred from the assiduous homage paid to that pernicious beverage, so egregiously miscalled 'water of life.' Intoxication at Easter is universally excused; and it is so general at this festival, that, in Little Russia in particular, you find villages where the whole population is drunk. Hence arise, of course, many disorders: serfs run away from their masters, and servants are dismissed for misbehaviour, at Easter. Foreigners especially are put to their shifts at this season, and are frequently left to wait upon themselves at Easter, when no Russian can be kept under control. Among any other nation, however, amidst such a general frenzy, a hundred thousand times more scandals and offences would be committed. A Russian Easter, enacted in England or Italy, would be a real scene of bloodshed and murder; and it is entirely owing to the Russian national character, to the peculiar good-nature and peaceable disposition of these people, that upon the whole far more comic and merely repulsive than sanguinary incidents occur at this season. In illustration of this point, I subjoin a few of my street observations.

'In the capital of the Ukraine, I once walked out, on Easter Monday, beyond the gate, through which numbers of people, men and women, were pouring in, all of them tottering and intoxicated; for in the country brandy is cheaper than in the towns, where the sale of spirits is a monopoly. As I stopped and looked after them, shaking my head, and astonished at the sight, the last of these merrimakers reeled up to me, and said, taking off his hat, 'Drunken people, sir! It is a holiday; excuse them—pray excuse them! Be not angry, sir, I beseech you. Be not angry, sir; God has given us a holiday to-day.' Nothing would serve him, but I must give him my hand, and promise to forgive what I, a foreigner, had no power whatever to punish.

'In another town I once saw, during the Easter diversions, a drunken man take off his hat in the same manner in the public place before the governor, fall upon his knees, and seize his hand, saying, 'Ah! I am drunk, your excellency! it is a holiday to-day; let me be flogged—I have drunk too much; I beseech your excellency to let me be punished:' and the governor could not get away till he had given the man a sharp reprimand.'—pp. 182, 183.

We need not repeat the opinion already expressed on this work. The extracts we have given will speak for themselves, and the volume from which they are taken is fully entitled to share in the commendation we bestowed last month on its predecessor.

Art. VII. *Tracts published by the National Complete Suffrage Union.*

1. *The Suffrage: An Appeal to the Middle Classes by one of themselves.*
2. *Minutes of the Conference of the Middle and Working Classes, held at Birmingham, April* 1842, *and Appendix of Documents, List of Delegates, &c.*
3. *Report of the Proceedings of the Conference, &c. &c.*
4. *The National Complete Suffrage Union to their Country.*
5. *Rules and Objects of the National Complete Suffrage Union.*
6. *Circulars issued to Associations by the Council of the National Complete Suffrage Union.*

In our Number for April last, we took a hasty glance at Chartism. From amidst the rubbish of ignorant dogmatism in which furious demagogues had buried them, we endeavoured to pick out the great political principles which that ill-omened term is used to represent, and to submit them, in their unconcealed and unadorned dignity, to the notice of our readers. We hold ourselves under obligation, in the discharge of our duty as journalists, to deal fearlessly and impartially with every topic which stands out in prominent relief before the public eye; and we wish to bear in mind that we may bring equal guilt upon ourselves by neglecting misapprehended and despised worth, as by lending our sanction to showy and fashionable worthlessness. We should but ill answer it to our own conscience, in a searching and solemn review of our labours, if we could be justly charged with going out of our way to avoid subjects which fairly appeal to us for judgment, lest by a calm and patient examination of them we might awaken suspicion, or with surrendering our reason to clamour, from an unmanly fear of pronouncing a decided opinion at variance with the tastes, feelings, and habits of surrounding friends. We are now about to call attention to a kindred topic, and as a fitting introduction to it, we request leave to make a few general and preliminary observations.

It is always of some importance, as a means to brace up our minds to serious investigation when unwelcome subjects obtrude themselves upon our notice, to reflect that, in reference to truth, in every department, we are under a law of probation. Reflection exercised upon those materials which experience has put within our reach, teaches us to recognise and to admire that principle of providential administration which connects the perception of truth with integrity of purpose and honesty of heart. Hitherto we have had no important revelation, natural or supernal, the mere enunciation of which has insured its imme-

diate triumph. Never, so far as we know, has the introduction into society of a new moral element been compassed by virtue of its alliance with adventitious advantages. 'The kingdom of God cometh not with observation.' The powers to which human hearts are bidden to do homage, borrow no aid from superficial lustre and outward pomp; and He who 'knows what is in man,' has taken care that the trappings of truth shall not be of such sort as to win that attention which herself would fail to command. It would even appear that, just in proportion to the real importance and dignity of a subject, and to the extent of that power which it is eventually destined to wield over human minds, are usually found the meanness of its earthly origin, the lowliness of its early circumstances, and the repulsive vulgarity and glaring misbehaviour of its first adherents. The world was slow enough to believe that the great mystery of man's redemption lay wrapped up in the unlettered minds and rude speech of a little knot of Jewish fishermen and tax-gatherers. His would have been a prophetic eye of no ordinary range and power, who could have predicted of the monk at Erfurth, engaged in sweeping the apartments and tilling the garden of the then obscure monastic establishment, that cradled in that man's soul there slept, at that moment, a power which, when subsequently called into action, would make the nations of Europe bow, as the pine forests bend to the northern blast, and would turn the world's history into a new channel.

The primary and essential maxims constituting the substantial masonry and solid timbers of that temple of wisdom, which age after age is employed in constructing, with toil so vast, and with progress so slow and imperceptible, are not found in the haunts of refinement and cultivation. We have to go for them to the desolate wastes of society. There, in rude, unshapen masses, amid scenes the most uninviting, and as if consigned to eternal neglect, we discover, in the greatest abundance, the materials which unwearied thought must hew into shape, and stern moral courage must bring to their appropriate and final position in the edifice. It is somewhere remarked by Dr. Vaughan, that virtue commonly ascends from the multitude to their rulers—from the broad basement to the elevated peaks of the social world. A similar remark may be made of practical truth, which is, indeed, the matrix of virtue. The elemental stuff which, in its concrete state, we call axioms, is diffused in unsuspected abundance through the lower strata of mankind. It may be extracted in larger quantities, and often in more unalloyed condition, from common notions and vulgar proverbs, than from fashionable sentiments. Man, when he has nothing external on which to value himself,

has, in most cases, a keen eye to what befits *man*. The conclusions at which he arrives are, for the most part, pitched upon in consequence of their obvious congruity with the real wants of human nature. Artificial modes of existence call for moral inventions to harmonize with them—principles framed with an especial view to the novelty of the position. Conventional life gives being to conventional maxims, and in politics equally as in morals, substantial truth is overlaid with the expedients of refinement. Hence it invariably happens, that all great and permanent changes work from beneath—that the germs of those laws, upon the ultimate recognition of which social happiness is contingent, quicken first in the minds of the untutored poor, and that the soundest principles emerge from that unlooked for quarter, first to provoke the derision, and eventually to compel the homage of the great and good of every class.

It may be further worthy of remark, that the earliest progress of important truths to universal empire, is generally marked by circumstantial characteristics, which subject such truths, and those to whom they appeal for reception and obedience, to the severest test. Novelties of any 'mark and likelihood,' are sure, upon their first appearance, to collect about them votaries of every shade of character. The vile as well as the virtuous—the selfish as readily as the disinterested—minds which are ever prowling about in quest of excitement—affections worn into premature exhaustion by excess—knavery which detects a new and hopeful chance of turning credulity to account—vanity which has sought distinction to no purpose in the beaten paths of life—enthusiasm, whose attachment to its new idol overleaps all the fences of decency in its endeavours to exalt it, all gather about the stranger in confused and tumultuous crowds. It would seem as though this were God's provision for smothering the *lusus naturæ* of the moral world. So perverse and wayward is the human mind, that it is impossible to predict what would be the ultimate destiny of the most hideous monstrosities, were they only set off by respectability and consistency in their early worshippers. If the grave and serious alone, if the well-intentioned only, and the ingenuous, were to bend the knee at the shrine of newly-proclaimed divinities, one cannot foresee what would be the duration of their reign. Whereas, happily, according to the present law, the grotesque inanities are soon defiled by their own votaries, and having no vital principle, rot beneath the heap of infamy in which their followers contrive to carry them. But if error has to go through this ordeal, so has truth, and truth only can abide and survive it. The absurdities and misconduct of its professed admirers will, in no case, be wanting to bring it into bad odour;

its reputation will be tainted, its name will be associated with everything criminal and base. Now, as in former times—in this, as in another and a more sacred instance—the prudes and pharisees of this world will start back with horror at its approach, and say, 'It is a devil.' For this is no new feature of earth's history. The precious is here, oftentimes, in close juxta-position with the vile; the tares and the wheat, in more senses than one, grow together, and, distinct as they are in nature, can only be discriminated by close investigation carried on under the direction of honest purpose. There are other things spoken to us 'in parables' besides religion, and in other spheres a necessity for that law which ordains 'By hearing ye shall hear, and not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive.'

We have ventured upon the preceding train of thought with a view to caution our readers against the common danger of avoiding subjects soliciting inquiry, simply because they have hitherto gained consideration only among the vulgar, or have presented themselves to notice clouded with the misdeeds of unprincipled men. Against the prevailing habit of dismissing from us every newly-discovered principle until the rulers have believed in it, Christian citizens are bound to be especially on their guard. That system of doctrine which now shines forth as emphatically 'the light of the world,' those principles of religious liberty which are the glory of modern times, and which even the statesmen of our empire are compelled, in theory, to recognise—all that is intrinsically good and permanently vital among us, found their first home in the lowly vales of society, and have passed through successive stages of contempt, obloquy, opposition, and scorn. It becomes not those who now reap the laurels and enjoy the fruits of other men's patient endurance of reproach, to stand by in unconcern and witness truth hunted down by mere clamour, or consigned to cold neglect for the follies of its friends. 'Fair play is a jewel,'—a jewel which ought to grace every Christian brow, and assuredly protestant dissenters should be the last men in the world to join in hooting at any doctrine, religious or political, which has not upon it the stamp of this world's respectability. 'Be not forgetful to entertain strangers, for thereby some have entertained angels unawares.'

Representation, as the basis of civil government, is one of those principles the birth of which is concealed in obscurity. Whensoever, or to whomsoever, it first occurred, it was a happy thought. Some daughter of Pharoah, it may be, tended it in infancy, and reared into youth the power ordained in after days to shake into ruins the Egyptian supremacy of 'divine right.' Doubtless it grew into importance unobserved, and many failures, many dis-

asters, marked the trials of its young and inexperienced strength. It would be useless to our present purpose, even were it possible, to observe the successive unfoldings of its power, the gradual development of its inherent virtues; it is sufficient for us to know that it has established its empire in this our world, and is, every year, extending the boundaries of its dominion. It has compelled the assent, it has won the approval, of every man who lays the slightest claim to a reputation for intelligence. Poets have sung of it. Statesmen have lauded it. Philosophers have done it homage. National greatness has here and elsewhere grown up under its auspices. It is no longer a thing for reason to discuss, but for experience and sagacity to perfect. The question is no longer whether it ought to be, but how it *shall* be to best advantage? It has obtained for itself a footing which precludes dispute, and the only inquiry remaining is, how to turn its presence among us to most profitable account.

Representation is the only well-defined and tangible form hitherto discovered of the abstract truth, 'The people are the only legitimate source of political power,' or in other words, 'Government is made for man, and not man for government.' This truth, it is probable, has been floating, unformed, in the mind of society, in all ages. Dim and confused notions of it all men appear to have, and, under the sternest despotisms, occasionally to act upon. Like electric fluid it may, for the most part, have been latent, and its presence might have been plausibly denied, but for those occasional junctures of events when it has flashed forth in sudden insurrectionary explosions. The lightning of popular wrath has, in every clime under heaven, revealed, at one and the same time, the universal belief, and, when excited, the terrible energy of this abstract notion of the rights of man. Representation, however, is the only fixed form in which it has embodied itself. Herein the spiritual is seen passing into the practical. It is the outward reality in search of which society had long groped its way in darkness, conscious of want which incessantly craved for satisfaction. Its adaptation to meet the exigencies of the case, and to fulfil the demands of the primary truth to which we have adverted, carries with it a self-evidencing power. The theory of representation, therefore, has found few direct opponents. Equity and expediency unite to recommend it; and they who in practice violate its spirit, equally with those who are anxious to see it fairly developed, are proud to weave a garland for its head.

It may seem strange, but it is not more strange than true, that men can admire as an idea, what they despise as a fact. And yet, the doctrine of representation, to which most men willingly

yield assent, and which they are forward to praise as heaven-born, has, in all its attempts to embody itself in the civil institutions of this country, been called to maintain an incessant and arduous struggle with prejudice and contempt. Not only have those whose selfish interests stood opposed to the practical realization of this much lauded idea, bestrewn its path with obstacles, but even the sober, the educated, the religious, have dealt out to it unmeasured scorn. With ease the most unaccountable, they seem to forget that the eulogiums they have pronounced upon its character belong, not to the semblance of the thing, but to the thing itself—not to the name, but to the reality. Observe, now, the direction which all the outcry against the principles of what is now called 'complete suffrage,' takes. It is all levelled, most of it, we verily believe, in ignorance, at representation itself. Nothing more is meant, nothing more can be understood by complete suffrage, or by the principles of the charter, than that what is now only a theory assented to by all, shall be converted into a fact for the advantage of all; and that what our lawyers and statesmen have uniformly recognised as the genius of the English constitution, should be clothed with real authority, instead of being merely decked, as now, with an empty title to speculative homage.

If it be true, as all will be, and are, forward to admit, that legitimate government must be from the people, and that the proper method of arriving at it is by representation, it will be difficult, we imagine, to deny that the ideal involved is the *equal* representation of the *entire* people. Despotism is one thing, self-government is another. But despotism is not the less despotism when wielded by a class than when residing in the hands of a single individual. It matters not that some have delegated to others the power of ruling over all. They who delegated such power are bound to show valid grounds of authority for what they do. They must enjoy their privilege, either by divine right, or by the consent and appointment of the whole body of the governed. To one or other of these they must trace their authority, or they tacitly admit that it is founded on nothing better than usurpation. The class excluded is essentially a slave-class; the power which compels their submission, centre where it may, is an arbitrary and irresponsible power. If this be consistent with equity, unmixed despotism is equally so; and if that be true, then is the maxim false, that 'the people are the only proper source of political power.'

The doctrine of 'complete suffrage' is substantially the doctrine of government based upon national representation. Every one of its principles turns out, upon inquiry, to be but an essential

property of that one idea. Parliament selected *by* a class, whether more or less numerous, is absolutism shared by many instead of engrossed by one. Parliament selected *from* a class, is not representation, even where the constituency is co-extensive with the nation; for although all may vote, all do not choose. Parliament inadequately responsible, may be representation for a brief period, but will speedily run into despotic power; it is not permanent representation, for it carries within itself the seeds of its own death. Parliament elected by a whole people, but composed of members chosen by grossly unequal numbers—here by a few hundreds, there by many thousands, is representation in appearance rather than in reality; for by it, it may happen that we get not at the mind of the nation, but at that of a small and manageable section of it. Lastly, parliament selected under the pressure of external constraint, is not representation, but misrepresentation; for votes, in such case, become the records, not of a people's will, but of a people's helplessness. Here, then, we have what are technically denominated the 'six points.' In fact, however, they all merge in one, and that one is real, as distinguished from nominal, representation. The essential principle involves, of necessity, the particulars. Terms may be objected to, machinery may be, in this or the other instance, regarded as inefficient; but he who intelligently embraces the doctrine of government by representation, as opposed to government by arbitrary power, must acknowledge the propriety of making it 'full, fair, and free,' and such an acknowledgment is a virtual acquiescence in all the points contended for, not, indeed, in letter, but in substance and spirit.

The full development of the doctrine of representation in this more elaborate, and, at first view, complex form, is by no means new, nor does it belong to the present century. In the last decade of the preceding one, it pushed itself into notice, and obtained for itself considerable celebrity. That it made rapid strides in popular affections may be gathered from the violence with which it was assailed. The course of the French revolution failing to imprint upon the hearts of the ruling classes the solemn burden which Providence had commissioned it to declare, namely, the certainty with which oppression draws down punishment, stimulated the passions which it was designed to awe. The alarm of the aristocracy prompted them to cruelty, and the state-church, in every parish of the empire, abetted their now furious tyranny. The crushing enginery of law was repaired, enlarged, put in motion, and brought to bear with overwhelming power upon the devoted heads of parliamentary reformers. The upper fountains of opinion poured forth in continuous streams

into the public mind falsehood, invective, and bitter contempt. The respectability of this world ranged itself against the rights of man. Then, as now, offensive nicknames were hurled in clouds against the apostles and disciples of real representation, and every man who sought for the people a system of self-government, lost *status* in the estimation of his friends, was branded as a 'Jacobin' and denounced as an infidel. In this work, the church, as usual, took a leading and active part. Every pulpit of the establishment rang with the most virulent abuse of 'levellers' and 'atheists;' Scripture was perverted, with profane zeal, to play upon the ignorance of the multitude, and to rouse the most infernal passions, until, goaded to frenzy, lawless mobs, drunk with beer and with clerical precepts, rose against the most active friends of human progress, and, with the connivance of the magistrates, destroyed the property of reformers, and drove the most conspicuous of them to other and more hospitable lands. This was the first act of the great drama not yet played out. The active friends of real representation were dispersed, its converts silenced, and the principle which had put forth such vigorous branches, was cut down to its roots.

Those roots, however, were vital. Fury could not reach them. Law could not extract them from the soil of human hearts. Violence could not kill them. They remained—the principle remained, unchanged and unchangeable. The truth which quickened it no tyranny could destroy; the congruity of that truth with reason, equity, and the spirit of Christianity, no state prosecutions nor clerical vituperations could crush out of it. All that commended it to the mind of the country previously to this outbreak of aristocratic anger, survived the storm. Not an argument perished in the crusade. Not a living germ was spilt. Years rolled on, adding to the world's age, to the country's experience, and to the taxation of the people. War made its entrance upon the stage of events, and for a time engrossed the attention which had been, heretofore, directed to 'national representation.' It was an interval of madness. Excited passion hurried forward the nation in the career of ruin. The voice of prudence was drowned in the din of conflict, and, under cover of the 'pride, pomp, and circumstance of glorious war,' government bound upon the shoulders of the people an unprecedented, and, as it seems likely to prove, an intolerable burden of debt. The game of the aristocracy was played out. The fit of insanity was over. Peace came, and with it exhaustion, distress, discontent, reflection. The doctrine of government, by *bona fide* national representation, again presented itself to the public mind, and again its progress was like the lightning shining from the east unto the west. A second revolution in France, marked by unwonted

moderation in its leaders, occurring simultaneously with a general election in this empire, gave an impulse to the cause which aristocracy strove in vain to stem. The Duke of Wellington, by his memorable *dictum*, sought to bar out the incoming tide of popular feeling, but the swelling flood speedily swept it away. The Tory ministry were beaten in their own house—they made way for the Whigs, and after a brief but severe struggle, the Reform Bill became law.

The second act of the drama closed in seeming triumph. In the first, the people had been put down—in the second, they were deceived. It is painful, at this day, to look back upon the delirium of joy which followed the success of this effort for real representation. That long, loud, universal shout of gladness which shook the earth and rose up to heaven, gave testimony to the hold which the idea had taken of the nation's heart. Wisely was it concealed from them, at that moment of excitement, that they had 'scotched the snake only, not killed it.' The truth displayed itself by slow degrees. The rush which the people had made against the outer barriers reared by aristocracy to keep out government by opinion, carried them on beyond the line of parliamentary reform, and served to put within their reach a few of the more important objects upon which they had set their hearts. The middle classes fancied they had reaped satisfactory results from the change. A new election, under the auspices of a Tory administration, now recalled to power by William the Fourth, brought to light some of the prominent defects of the new system of representation, and proved the existing machinery to be inadequate to give full expression to the popular will. Meanwhile, owing to causes which we cannot stay to specify, the commerce of the country received a sudden expansion. Trade flourished. Manufacturing capital and enterprise won golden spoils. The middle classes, devoted to the successful pursuits of wealth, viewed the gradual re-encroachments of the aristocracy without serious concern. It was not in the midst of social prosperity that the failure of the Reform Bill was to be detected. The victory they had achieved, it was even then apparent, was not so complete as they had, at first, hoped for; but on the whole, they were not disposed to complain. Presently, the commercial horizon became darkened, and the bare prospect of want of employment, rendered more gloomy by the enactment of the New Poor Law, forced upon the vast masses of the working men of the country the fact that, whatever others might be, *they* were unrepresented.

Again, the hero of the piece, the doctrine of government by national representation, came forward upon the stage, and, this time, it took the form of 'The People's Charter.' The principles

contained in this document, as we have already intimated, were not novel, but they were now chiefly interesting to the labouring classes. They whom the Reform Bill had admitted to the franchise, did not yet perceive that the question involved touched them as really, although not so directly, as it did the unrepresented. Believing, as they did, that the supreme power of the state was lodged in their hands, and that the aristocracy were virtually at their mercy, they saw no pressing necessity for enlarging the basis of the constitution. The old doctrine, consequently, came to be viewed in a new and very disadvantageous light. It was regarded as only the poor man's question, and, as such, it was left exclusively to the poor. The consequences of this mistake were disastrous. Alienation of feeling quickly succeeded an apprehended diversity of interests. The classes drew off each from the other. The poor, left to fight their own battle, nourished a fatal resentment against all above them. Keen-eyed demagogues took advantage of their position, fanned their anger, and organized their numbers. What the electors would not help them to do, they resolved to effect by their own unaided strength. There were not wanting men to remind them that the physical force of the country dwelt with them. The Reform Bill had been carried by a demonstration of that force—why should not the Charter be wrested from the ruling powers by an employment of it? Foolish preparations were accordingly made. A rising was attempted. A few riots scared the middle-classes into an utter renunciation of the very principle which themselves had insisted upon in the Reform Bill, and threw them into willing alliance with might against right. The military put down insurrection with the utmost ease, and the folly and misconduct of the Chartists dismissed the subject of national representation from the public mind, covered with their own disgrace. Such was the pitiable termination of act the third.

Simultaneously with this infatuated movement of the working men, the middle class laid siege to the strong-holds of monopoly. Commercial distress disturbed their tranquillity, and, as a body, entertaining an all but invincible repugnance to a complete organic reform, they determined upon wielding the existing machinery of representation, to work out a total repeal of the Corn Laws. The second parliament chosen under the Reform Bill laughed at them, positively hooted them, refused to give the question a hearing, and the prime minister—a Whig too, of the reform administration—taunted them with the madness of their project. This was the first baneful fruit of the division of the two great classes. Nevertheless, rude insult, received at the hands of their own representatives, did not prevent the middle-class from agitating the question which they had made up their minds

to settle. The increasing depression of trading and manufacturing industry lent weight to their arguments and pungency to their appeals. To the unwearied efforts of the anti-corn-law league came the financial embarrassments of the state, as though to ensure the success of the enterprise. Ministers had attempted to replenish an empty exchequer by adding to the burden of taxation, but their attempt had signally failed. Meanwhile, the expenditure of the country increased as its resources decayed. A change of system became a matter of necessity, and the Whig cabinet attacked first the sugar and timber monopolies; and, in their last extremity, dashed at the landed interest, by proposing a fixed duty of eight shillings per quarter on foreign corn. The monopolists united their forces, defeated the Whigs, and compelled them to appeal to the country. The worth of the Reform Bill was put to the test, and found wanting. A majority of conservatives, pledged against corn-law repeal, was returned. Parliament met. The Whig ministers were unceremoniously ousted by a direct resolution of want of confidence in them. Sir Robert Peel formed a new administration, dismissed the house, and said he would take time to consider.

It was now but too apparent that the supreme power of the empire was safely lodged in the hands of the aristocracy. The working men had tried in vain to overset it by means of physical violence; the middle class had been thrown, in their first struggle with it, on the narrow electoral ground ceded to them by the Reform Bill. The necessity for a cordial reconciliation between the two divided sections of the community could no longer be concealed. The thoughts of every honest patriot turned wistfully to that quarter. The *Nonconformist*, a weekly newspaper, then recently established, took the lead in the hopeful and much hoped-for enterprise. Reverting to the old subject of *bonâ fide* national representation, it laboured, through a series of articles, subsequently collected together in a cheap pamphlet, and widely circulated through all parts of the land, to demonstrate the right of the working men to the franchise, and, by calm reasoning, to meet the objections commonly urged in bar of their claim. Here, once more, the old doctrine was thrown upon the surface, with this variation only, that it appeared under a new name. The *Nonconformist* entitled it 'Complete Suffrage,' which cognomen, up to the present moment, it has retained.

This series of articles had not, we believe, been brought to a close, before a new actor appeared upon the stage. Attention had scarcely been afresh awakened, when a fitting man stood forth to turn it to account. This was none other than Joseph Sturge, a member of the Society of Friends, known to the British public by his philanthropic exertions for the liberation of the slaves in

our West Indian possessions. Mr. Sturge had just returned to England from a visit to the United States, whither he had proceeded, at his own expense, on an anti-slavery mission, and a tour of observation. Running a just line of discrimination between the social evils and the political institutions of that country, he drew his conclusions in favour of the latter, whilst he deplored with heartfelt sorrow the former. Almost immediately upon regaining his native land, he unhesitatingly stepped forth to convert that into a practical movement, which previously, had been little more than a happy idea.

At first sight, Joseph Sturge would not have appeared the man best qualified to conduct this fresh enterprise against arbitrary, and virtually irresponsible power. Gifted with intellectual ability, strong, it is true, but not commanding—neither possessing nor pretending to the powers of eloquence—it did not seem probable that his was the master-spirit which the exigencies of the country required. Nor in one sense was it. Had the work to which he stood pledged demanded a lofty genius, a mind capable of seeing at a glance the actual state of things, of reading by intuition a nation's real wants, and of swaying by its own pre-eminent strength the varied passions of conflicting classes, Joseph Sturge would have been unfitted for the arduous undertaking. Such a man, ordinary habits of thought had led the people to expect, to sigh for, as indispensable. Something akin to disappointment, therefore, was felt when Joseph Sturge appeared upon the scene. His appearance, however, has served to correct a very prevalent mistake. There is a power stronger than that of the intellect—qualifications of leadership, of more sterling worth than oratorical gifts. The cause of the suffrage wanted, above and beyond all things else, high character; and its only remaining chance of success was, that it should go forth to the world recommended by the stamp of moral dignity. Men had seen too many perversions of splendid abilities to confide in them again, and the temper of all parties was such as to render them accessible on this subject to no power but that of an honest and virtuous heart. Joseph Sturge brought in aid of this movement moral qualifications of no common order. Adopting the principles of peace, peculiar to the sect of which he was a member, attaching to them the highest importance, and exemplifying them in his own personal conduct and habits, he gave to society the most satisfactory guarantee, that under no circumstances would he consent to lead the people into violent collision with existing authorities. His translucent honesty imparted a still higher value to his mild and forbearing spirit. All who had marked his career might see that it was not a wild production of nature, standing where it originally shot up, but that it was

grafted upon a sense of responsibility and a fear of God. A heart naturally generous, converted by Christian love into the seat of ardent philanthropy—energies which no labours can weary—a simple devotedness to duty which shrinks from no sacrifice, stands appalled before no danger—faith in justice the most child-like and confiding, combined with unaffected distrust of himself—and when convinced of the rectitude of any given course, an indomitable will—such were the qualifications which fitted Joseph Sturge for the post into which Providence appeared to introduce him. The power of the man was speedily felt—the power of meekness and of moral worth. The suffrage question in his hands assumed a new and startling aspect. Its principles were what they ever had been, but its character was transformed. It was not now a rude, noisy, clamorous, and menacing thing, but a thing whose eye was gentle, whose voice was clear and soft, whose language was persuasive, and upon whose countenance played the light of pure benevolence. Truths which had hitherto been associated with violence, he set upon the basis of peace, threw around them the air of temperance, and, as far as the influence of a leader can extend, infused into them the mild but resolute, the forbearing but equally indomitable spirit of religion.

To hearts flaming with earnestness of purpose, opportunities for action are speedily revealed. The fire within them, like a blazing torch, flings abroad its own rays, and discloses to view, tinged with its own light, modes and means of putting intention into effect, which, to listless observers, would have been shrouded in darkness. A meeting of anti-corn-law deputies assembled at Manchester, on Wednesday, November 17, 1841. Mr. Sturge, who had taken a deep interest in the movement for the repeal of the tax on the subsistence of the people, attended that meeting. At the conclusion of the business for which the deputies had been specially convened, the chair having been vacated, and a new chairman appointed, Mr. Sturge, in a very unpretending manner, brought forward the subject of 'complete suffrage.' A free conversation ensued, and a general desire was expressed by the body of deputies then present, to promote a movement for thorough organic reform. A resolution requesting Joseph Sturge and W. Sharman Crawford, M.P. for Rochdale, to draw up a declaration, which, after signature by the deputies, might be published, was passed unanimously. A brief interval of silence and seeming inaction succeeded. About the middle of December, however, we find Mr. Sturge again at Manchester, and immediately afterwards the following declaration was put forth:—

'Deeply impressed with the conviction of the evils arising from class legislation, and of the sufferings thereby inflicted upon our in-

dustrious fellow-subjects, the undersigned affirm that a large majority of the people of this country are unjustly excluded from that fair, full, and free exercise of the elective franchise to which they are entitled by the great principle of Christian equity, and also by the British constitution, for 'no subject of England can be constrained to pay any aids or taxes, even for the defence of the realme, or the support of the government, but such as are imposed by his own consent, or that of his representatives in parliament.'"*

To this declaration Mr. Sturge first appended his own name; and considering the framing of it to have originated in the request of the friends of the total and immediate repeal of the Corn Laws, he placed it first in their hands, to give them an opportunity of procuring signatures. It was then sent forth as a means of gauging the reform feeling of the existing constituencies. The active exertions of Mr. Sturge for the abolition of slavery, and for the promotion of peace and temperance, opened to him special facilities for carrying out his designs. He put himself in communication with the known and prominent friends of these causes. Within these circles, his was a charmed name, carrying with it a moral influence of no common potency. The great principle of real representation embodied in the above declaration, thus flowed to the public mind through untainted channels, and came under general notice, sparkling in its own purity, unclouded by the turbid elements of faction or of party.

A convention of anti-corn-law delegates at Edinburgh, a banquet at Glasgow, and the great anti-corn-law conference in London, severally held at the commencement of 1842, offered fresh opportunities to the now installed representative of the suffrage question, to proclaim and enforce his views, of which he was not backward to avail himself. In each instance, the occasion was specially fitting, the line of proceeding was wisely chosen, and the success was exhilarating. The doctrine of full, fair, and free representation, was thus brought under the notice of picked men of the middle class, both English and Scotch, at a moment when the grievous wrong under which they groaned, and to throw off which, they had assembled together, laid bare to the quick their sense of the evils of class legislation. In no case did Mr. Sturge impede the specific business which these delegates had gathered together to transact, or with unseemly zeal thrust his opinions upon men when occupied with their own affairs. Time and place were fixed upon, distinct and apart from the session of deputies, who were invited by private circular to free converse with Mr. Sturge, on that subject which now filled his heart. The mildness of his manners, the sim-

* See Blackstone's Commentaries, vol. i., book i., chap. i.

plicity of his speech, his evident sincerity of purpose and benevolence of soul, added weight to the justice and reasonableness of the truths he propounded. The course of events, however, operated still more powerfully to further his views. Sir Robert Peel's new sliding scale was submitted to the legislature, and the advocates of free trade felt and resented the premier's policy as equally insulting and cruel. The hopelessness of efficient relief from a parliament of landed proprietors stared them in the face, and momentary despair drove numbers to take refuge in the movement for complete suffrage. The progress of that question was, accordingly, rapid beyond all former precedent; but it was ostensible, rather than real—the sudden wash of a flood, not the steady rising of a tide—the outburst of passion, far more than the growth of principle.

Such as it was, however, it invited instant action. Transient or abiding as might be this not unexpected swell of feeling, prudence dictated the obvious policy of turning it to account—of digging channels into which a portion of it might run—of creating an organization which might serve to collect what was real, and to fix, if possible, what was originally volatile. A 'Birmingham Complete Suffrage Union' had been formed, and a provisional committee appointed. They cast into a suitable shape, for a memorial to the Queen, the declaration first issued, distributed it with appropriate directions throughout the country, and made the first approach to a reconciliation between the two divided classes, by inviting the signatures of both electors and non-electors. They gained two objects by this step. They were enabled by means of it to feel, without awakening suspicion, the pulse of the public temper; to ascertain whether hope might be reasonably entertained of healing the existing feud between the middle class and the working men; and they created a well-defined constituency for electing delegates representing both sections, who, in conference, might agree upon a common basis of reconciliation, upon which might be subsequently erected an efficient machinery of agitation. Their plan so far answered their wishes as to convince them of the expediency of summoning a conference forthwith. It is not our purpose to discuss the policy, but simply to sketch the outline, of their proceedings. That wisdom which comes after the event is, invariably, as worthless as it is cheap. Men can only form their judgment upon the materials which come within their reach, but all existing materials, the unknown as well as the known, will go to make up the actual issue. Hence, the fallibility of those who go before facts, and the infallibility of those who come after them. 'I think it *will be* so and so,' is much more likely to be wrong than 'I thought it *would be* so and so.' Direct overtures to reconciliation were

possibly not the most feasible method of securing it; and the first symptoms of returning good feeling may not always indicate the fulness of time, when previously hostile parties should be set face to face, and urged to settle terms of agreement and shake hands. The subsidence of ill-will is always somewhat slow, and the wounds of pride, even where the healing process has fairly commenced, do not at once lose their irritability. These wise reflections, we confess, have been mainly suggested to our minds by the results of the conference alluded to, rather than by a glance at the ascertained *a priori* probabilities. If we had fears that the proposed gathering was premature, they were not, it may be conceded, deeply rooted in our judgment; nor have we, perhaps, as yet, a right to affirm that those fears have been subsequently realized. But we will not detain our readers in suspense. We proceed, therefore, with the history.

The conference assembled at Birmingham on the 5th of April, 1842. Eighty-seven delegates from different parts of England and Scotland, and four visitors from Ireland, met the provisional committee, who were allowed to take part in the proceedings, but not to vote. The chamber in which they met was the committee room of the New Town Hall, a somewhat dark and gloomy room, not altogether out of keeping with the grave solemnity of the occasion. A long table ran down its centre, and the benches occupied by the delegates were ranged on either hand, and at both ends of it, in form similar to that of the House of Commons. The men deputed to represent the respective classes mingled freely together, nor, except in individual instances, could either party be distinguished by the external aspect of its representatives. The proceedings were not unworthy of the business in hand. The sessions of the body lasted four days, the discussions occupying about nine hours each day. The forms observed were regular, and adhered to with the utmost strictness. Brilliant speeches there were none, but the debates were always animated, and for the most part well sustained. Sentiments were aptly expressed and forcibly delivered. A deep tone of earnestness ran through them all. The errors of the past were freely adverted to on both sides, and occasionally self-vindication compelled the speakers to tread upon tender ground; yet not once during the whole time did interruption occur, or disapprobation find vent in rude clamour. Excitement was intense, but it glowed rather than flamed. Profound attention was, with few exceptions, given to each speaker, without distinction of party. There were no outbreaks of passion—no effusions of bile, or violence of recrimination. The spirit of conciliation took off the sharp edges of firm resolve. Care for the public weal appeared to hold in hand, and to control with little

effort the impetuosity of strong attachments. As the several stages of interval between the two sections were safely passed, interest became more feverish; and when the last topic of difference, the discussion upon which lasted the whole of the third day, was under debate, excitement verged upon the bounds of irritability. At this moment a trivial incident occurred which seemed likely to destroy the whole work of the previous sessions. The representatives of the working men, with the leave of the conference, retired to another room to remodify a critical resolution. Indications had previously appeared that feeling was growing serious. The time allotted for absence was ten minutes. The conference waited three quarters of an hour. Murmurs of dissatisfaction passed to and fro amongst the middle-class delegates, who began to fancy their patience was trifled with. A message was despatched to the parties who had retired, that unless they could speedily agree upon their resolution, the conference would feel itself compelled to proceed with other business. The messenger returned, and with a supercilious air, gave answer that 'the conference might proceed to other business as soon as they pleased.' The spark dropped upon inflammable materials, but the fire of resentment was quickly extinguished. It was hinted by one of the delegates present, that the offensiveness of the message might possibly be in the manners of the messenger, and that a quarter of an hour's further forbearance might be rewarded by substantial agreement. Within five minutes of this incident the party returned. Every eye turned anxiously towards them;—all held their breath in expectation. The silence was oppressive. Mr. Lovett then stood forward and read the resolution upon which the representatives of the working men were agreed. Its tone was conciliatory, and its tenour reasonable. A modification or two was suggested, which Mr. Lovett consented to adopt. The last ground of dispute was now cut away. Joy gleamed in every eye, and in some, glittered behind tears. The resolution was put to the meeting. Every hand was held up in its favour—and now emotion would have vent. A shout of triumph shook the walls of the committee room. Delegates of both classes grasped each other by the hand, and mutually congratulated each other upon their happy escape from the menaced danger.

The last day's work of the conference involved few points for discussion. It consisted chiefly in adopting plans of practical organization, framed with a view to give effect to the principles already recognised. It will be unnecessary for us to bring under the notice of our readers the several resolutions, addresses, or rules agreed upon. The first practical resolution is the only one we shall cite. It runs thus:—

'That an association be now formed to be entitled, '*The National Complete Suffrage Union*,' and that the following be its object:—1. The creating and extending an enlightened public opinion in favour of the principle and necessary details of complete suffrage,—viz., the extension of the elective franchise to every man twenty-one years of age, who has not been deprived of his citizenship in consequence of a verdict of his countrymen; the abolition of the property qualification for members of parliament; the adoption of voting by ballot; the dividing the country into equal electoral districts; the payment of all the legal election expenses, and a reasonable remuneration to members of parliament; and that annual parliaments are a proper means for securing responsibility of members to their constituents.'

The spirit in which the agitation of these political truths is to be carried on, appears in the following extract from the first address of 'The National Complete Suffrage Union to their countrymen':—

'Having assumed as our basis the principle of universal adult male suffrage, labour for its diffusion among all classes; keep simply by the principle. Believing that union is strength, abstain from every source of mutual recrimination; bury past animosities; consign to oblivion hitherto discrepancies of sentiment; abolish, as far as may be, every term and watchword that may have been the badge of party or section; and, henceforth, in language simple as your aim, strive in harmony for the welfare of our common country. Draw your ammunition from the magazine of argument; take every suitable opportunity to discuss in a free and kindly spirit the things in which you may have differed from others, or among yourselves; studiously retain your temper as you would preserve yourself and persuade your opponent.'

The adoption by the conference of the six points, whilst it tended to prove the honesty of the middle class delegates, was not calculated to advance the cause with that section of the community which they ostensibly represented. Political knowledge had not yet made such rapid strides as to help recent and timid converts to the conclusion, that these points were but integral portions of one great principle. Numbers, therefore, who had given in a hesitating adherence to the truth of complete suffrage, seen only in its simplicity, and who believed themselves to have been already driven by stress of misgovernment to the recognition of a bolder and more democratic doctrine than they would have spontaneously embraced, took alarm at the decision of the conference, and retreated upon conclusions which, as they were more familiarly known, were regarded as more safe and satisfactory. It is somewhat singular, that the only two points violently objected to were also the only two points sanctioned by the ancient practice of the constitution—annual parliaments and the payment of members. There existed a strong proba-

bility, that had the majority of the working men consented to restrict immediate agitation, to the suffrage and the ballot, success would have been much more rapid, and the remaining details would have followed as a matter of course. Such a concession, however, under the circumstances of the case, was hardly to be expected. They had the best of the argument, and they considered it but fair to press it. They could show reason in favour of all their claims, even if they could not display prudence in putting forward the whole of them in one batch. The result was not only foreseen, but distinctly foretold. The light let in upon the just-awaking minds of electors was too strong to be borne; and men who had begun to look about them without discomfort, pained by the sudden blaze, deliberately closed their eyes and turned to other subjects. As, however, in the earlier part of the year, the expansion, so now, the collapse of public favour was more apparent than real. It was plain that the progress of the question would now be slow in comparison of what it had been; but it was equally plain that every step would be sure.

At the request of the Birmingham conference, Mr. Sharman Crawford, member for Rochdale, undertook the task of testing the strength of the complete suffrage cause in the House of Commons. Accordingly, on Tuesday, April 21, he submitted to the House the following resolution:—

'Whereas various petitions have been presented to this House, stating to the effect that under the present system of election laws the people are not duly represented; and that they are thus deprived of the acknowledged right of freemen to have a voice in the making of the laws by which they are governed, and in imposing the taxes which they are required to pay; and, therefore, praying that the right of voting may be extended to the adult male population of the realm, subject to no limitations or restrictions but such as may be necessary for the safe and correct practical exercise of the right itself; that votes should be taken by the ballot; that election districts should be equalized, to accord with the number of electors; that no qualification should be demanded from members, but that of being duly elected by a majority of votes; that representatives should be paid for their services at the public expense; and that elections should be annual; and whereas, complaint having been made, as above stated, that under the present limitation of the franchise and laws of election, there is not a full and free representation of the people, it is, therefore, the duty of this House to take into immediate consideration the amendment of these laws, with a view of giving to every portion of the community a full, fair, and free representation in the Commons House of parliament; and this House will, on an early day, resolve itself into a committee of the whole House for the purpose of considering the same.'

The division in favour of this resolution was somewhat more favourable than might have been anticipated. There were, for the motion, sixty-seven votes, two tellers, four who paired off in favour of it, and one who had left the House in consequence of illness; making a total of seventy-four. The debate, however, greatly diminished the value of the division. It sufficiently indicated that most of those members who were willing to vote for an early consideration of the subject, were anything but friends to the doctrines of complete suffrage. The resolution, consequently, may be said to have failed of the only end which its promoters could have contemplated, for it did not furnish any certain clue to the real opinions of the people's representatives.

Meanwhile, beyond the walls of parliament, the cause made silent and not inconsiderable progress. Able lecturers were abroad, both in England and in Scotland. The exposure, by Mr. Roebuck's 'Elections' Compromise Committee,' of the infamously corrupt practices resorted to by parliamentary members and constituencies, and the indignation roused by the imposition of an Income Tax, opened the eyes of many to the necessity of a thorough change. One by one, a goodly number of the liberal provincial journals took up the question, and able articles followed each other, week after week, in quick succession, to batter down remaining objections to the movement. The Nottingham, Ipswich, and Southampton elections occurred almost simultaneously to develop its electoral strength, and to cheer on its friends. Associations were springing up in every large town, and in many of the smaller ones, north and south of the Tweed. All appearances served to quicken expectation of another, but sounder expansion of the public mind, when, driven to desperation by their sufferings, and left in neglect by the government and legislature of the country, the operatives broke out into wide-spread insurrection, and our mining and manufacturing districts became the scene of a strike unprecedented in its extent, singularly mild in its pervading characteristics, originally directed almost exclusively to an increase of wages, but artfully fomented and turned to political account by the old Chartist leaders. The authorities took the alarm. The middle classes were turned out as special constables. The police forces were strengthened. The military were despatched to the scenes of disorder—collision ensued in several towns—loss of life—exasperation of feeling—the old sore, not yet healed, broke out afresh—and the prospects of the complete suffrage movement were again overshadowed by a dark cloud.

The moment was a critical one. There was, on the one hand, a strong temptation to shrink from a manly and explicit avowal,

in the very whirlwind of popular commotion, of democratic principles; on the other, a danger of lending a seeming sanction to proceedings which set at defiance the authority of law. Government, too, was engaged in grappling with its now formidable foe, and zeal for crushing the insurrection overlooked niceties in dealing with the rights of the subject. In this emergency, Mr. Sturge and his coadjutors remained firmly at their post. They issued two addresses; the first, to the middle and enfranchised classes—the other, to the working and unenfranchised classes of their countrymen; the former, urging a prompt and peaceful demonstration of sympathy for the oppressed, and setting forth the triumph of the essential principles of *bonâ fide* national representation as the only sufficient safeguard of interests not yet ruined, and of constitutional liberties not yet destroyed; the latter assuring the misguided sons of toil of hearty condolence with them in their sufferings, and exhorting them to resign all hopeless contests, and to resort to peaceful efforts and moral means alone. The council at the same time adopted a memorial to the queen, and convened a conference for the 7th of September. The document bore upon the face of it sad marks of haste—the measure, of inconsideration—neither of which could find an excuse in aught less than the extempore character and immediate urgency of the crisis. The conference was necessarily postponed, and an extraordinary council convoked in its room. The result of its meeting was, the appointment of a national conference to be held at Birmingham during the last week of December, to seal, if possible, a union between the two classes, by agreeing upon the details of a bill embodying the principles of both, to be submitted to parliament in the ensuing sessions. Before these pages reach the hands of our readers, the fruits of this determination will be developed. We shall not, therefore, indulge in anticipations. At the time at which we write, appearances are not such as to warrant any sanguine expectations of a highly favourable issue. The cause is not yet strong enough in the affections of the middle class of this country to secure it against the designs of faction; and faction may haply ensure the passage of complete suffrage principles through another phasis, before they reach the heart of the great social body. Be this as it may, they will be not a whit the more or the less true. They may suffer a temporary eclipse, but they cannot be destroyed.

We have thus attempted to give our readers a sketch of the rise and progress of the complete suffrage movement: necessarily imperfect, it will, nevertheless, we trust, be found substantially accurate. We are unwilling to trespass further upon

the attention of our friends, but we cannot forbear a closing observation or two, suggested to our own minds by a review of the history, now for the first time submitted to the public.

No thoughtful student of passing events can have failed to mark the inextinguishable vitality of the deep central principle —government by real national representation; of which, corresponding societies, reform bills, charters, complete suffrage associations, are nothing more than successive shoots, modified only by the character of the times. How does it happen that, invariably, when the ordinary resources of conventional arrangements fail of securing the welfare of our country—in days of darkness and distress, when society is forced by stress of misfortune to quit its hold of fashionable fallacies, and to revert to the fundamental principles of equity,—how does it happen, we repeat, that the minds of men instinctively turn to this doctrine, and view it as the natural refuge from the evils of misgovernment? What hope is there of crushing it by opposition? What prospect of its dying of neglect? What likelihood of stifling it with contempt? Put down in one form, it quickly reappears in another. Every effort to root it out of the public heart has proved unsuccessful. It has laughed to scorn the violence put in motion against it by the aristocracy, as ghosts are said to smile at material weapons in the hands of man. It has survived the follies and crimes of its own professed friends; and ever, as it pushes itself afresh above the surface, it shows itself purged of some of the grosser elements with which it was erst associated. It is now allying itself with peace, sobriety, and Christian equity. It is putting forth its whole influence to assuage the unhallowed passions of party strife and sectional prejudice. It is addressing itself in the accents of meek remonstrance and calm appeal to the truest, the noblest, the most abiding feelings of the human heart. With self-respect unshaken, and in self-reliance not to be overmastered, it stands forth in the face of scorn, derision, hate, and perhaps danger, to solicit nothing more than reverent attention. It goes unabashed into the clear light of Christian truth and Christian morality, and asks the severest scrutiny of its pretensions when subjected to the full blaze of the religion of the gospel. If, consequently, it is to be banished these realms, it must be by far other methods than any hitherto employed. Certain it is, however, that the dearest interests of the country require either its speedy extinction, or its prompt recognition. The national mind can never reach a healthy state whilst this doctrine of complete representation continues to ferment it. These heavings to and fro—these restless tossings—these convulsive struggles, the inevitable consequence of a widespread sense of injustice, make sad inroads upon social peace,

and absorb in unceasing political agitation energies which else might run in far more useful channels. Nor can it be lost sight of, that as the movement extends, those who are resolved at all hazards to defeat it, must call in the aid of very questionable allies. Physical violence, even when it is distinguished by the government stamp, is not precisely the fittest guardian to whose protection religious men should be found resorting; and yet, nothing but efficient representation will render a resort to it superfluous. The final triumph of complete suffrage principles can only be deferred by sacrifices, civil, moral, and religious, which virtuous and patriotic men may well hesitate to make.

And wherefore should they make it? What are those inherent charms—what those happy fruits of aristocracy, that the truly religious of the community should eagerly gather around it to prevent its downfall? Which of its leading principles, or its usual practices, legitimately commends it to the affections of the followers of Christ? It has a glory, but it is the glory of earth, not of heaven; a refinement, but it is that of luxury, not of virtue; a code of honour, but it is based upon the subversion, not upon the recognition of the morality of revelation; an influence, but it is in favour of corruption, not of purity; pursuits, but they tend not to exalt society; a religion, but it is a religion of outward form, not of inward power. That it has done aught to advance the spiritual kingdom of our Lord—that it habitually harmonizes with the essential characteristics of that kingdom, with its primary laws and obvious designs—that it has proved itself a valuable auxiliary to truth—that, in the nature of things, its countenance may be calculated upon for the encouragement of peace, temperance, chastity, meekness, piety—no one out of its own exclusive pale will have the hardihood to assert. Why then should it be expected of those who have taken upon them the yoke of evangelic religion, that they should employ themselves in propping up on every hand principles of government and legislative privileges which have nothing in common with the world's highest welfare, and which are evidently marked out by their own intrinsic worthlessness, and by providential intimations, for ultimate dissolution and decay? If the spirituality of God's church be an object deserving of pursuit, of pecuniary risk, of worldly sacrifice, surely it will not be unbeseeming to men who are labouring, sighing, praying for its attainment, to ask themselves what one insurmountable obstacle it is which lies in their way to reach it. Is it class, or general representation—the exclusive or the democratic principle? Were the people fairly masters of their own affairs, how long would an established church continue to misrepresent Christianity, to foster popular ignorance, to cripple educational effort, to abet

every oppressive monopoly, to bless and consecrate the emblems and the spirit of war, and to hunt down, worry, and strip of its earthly comforts, vital godliness wherever it displays itself? Truly, protestant dissenters have little reason to cling with the tenacity of fond attachment to aristocratic supremacy. It will do but little in return to promote their interests, or to advance the cause of the Master whom they serve.

Politics have governed religion long enough; it is time that religion should govern politics. Those immortal—immortal because divine—principles of equity by which Christians regulate themselves, their homes, their churches, why should they not also give form and character to civil institutions? Carried out in this direction, do they become false? To give to others what we ask for ourselves—to recognise in all men the claims of their common relationship—to vindicate the poor, and to beware of 'calling the proud happy'—to sacrifice merely artificial distinctions, which, whilst they puff up human vanity, aggravate likewise human woe,—what prevents our aiming at these noble ends in the department of national politics? So far as we know, the complete suffrage movement is the first attempt in this land to mould government upon the principles of Christianity—the first avowed effort to modify political institutions by the light and life of evangelical morality. In obedience to the equity of the gospel, and in deference to its claims upon conscience, Mr. Sturge has himself taken up, and calls upon other men to take up, the cause of the politically degraded, the slaves of British exclusiveness and British *caste*. Prejudice against colour we are free from, for we have lived out of the reach of temptation; but prejudice against poverty twines itself with all the feelings of our hearts. Men in circumstances of respectability, even the best of them, see no great cruelty, no wrong, no humiliation, inflicted upon the poor by thrusting them out of the door of citizenship, and branding them as unworthy of civil trust, even to the extent of one poor vote. But let misfortune overtake them and hurry them down to the deep places of society, and when to all the inevitable disadvantages of destitution is superadded that of civil outlawry, probably their views will undergo a change. The lowliness to which Providence reduces us may be borne with cheerful spirit; it touches the circumstances of the man, but not the man himself. But it is hard to be doomed to neglect and forgetfulness by the laws of our fellows; for even when such things alter not our external condition, the iron enters into the soul. The poor may not ordinarily evince much feeling in the matter, nor display any acute sense of degradation. So much the worse; for it proves that oppression has rubbed away one of the finer elements of human nature, and has thus

prepared it for a course incompatible with due self-respect. We look to this movement with some interest, as being eminently adapted to call out into exercise some of the highest principles of Christian morals, as well as to produce some of the happiest fruits of Christian benevolence. Were the church of Christ in this country, as one man, to bless it—were good men of all sects to smile instead of frown upon its now infant efforts—were pious citizenship to lend it a willing and a guiding hand, instead of shrinking from it, lest perchance it might expose to the old taunt 'a friend of publicans and sinners,' it would hardly, we think, bring their religion into disrepute, or narrow the range of their influence,—it would not injure the church, it would do no harm to the world. Themselves would not be deteriorated; the poor would be greatly served.

One word more, and we have done. The scope of our remarks will be entirely misapprehended, should our readers impute to us an opinion that society is to be regenerated by political institutions. Were complete suffrage adopted to-morrow, men's hearts, habits, pursuits, beliefs, would still be what they are. It belongs not to forms of civil government to purge the human mind of its natural grossness, to destroy its selfishness, or to open to it the fountains of true happiness. Organic change, even the most searching and complete, will assuredly fail to touch the evil that is *in* man. It will make him neither virtuous nor blest. True Christianity alone is competent to grapple with and to subdue, to exalt and to refine our common nature. But complete suffrage may, and we verily believe, will, remove from between Christianity and the people of this empire, many conventional and artificial barriers. It will tend to break down the spirit of *caste*, than which nothing is more inimical to the triumphs of revealed truth. It will allay the excitement and exasperation of party politics. It will put an end to monopolies, which, like a chain of forts, have in this country, from time immemorial, obstructed the free march of the religion of Jesus. It will sweep out of the way a system of ecclesiastical sanctity and priestly mediation, the worldly emoluments and the legal power of whose official agents and abettors have always stood opposed to the spread of genuine piety. It will thus open to the gospel a wide door of utterance—will give it room for free and effectual play—will throw the church of Christ upon its own resources, and compel it to fling off that immense mass of hypocrisy which now cleaves to it, which conceals its real character, paralyses its tenderest sympathies, and well nigh deprives it of influence for good. Therefore it is that we take a deep religious interest in the progress of a movement, in itself, purely political. We have unbounded confidence in the energies, the

skill, the power of Christianity, and we are anxious to see her have fair play, which aristocratic supremacy will never allow her. And if by acting upon the principles of revealed truth in regard to civil affairs—if, by subjecting our political creed to its penetrating and kindly influences, it should be so ordered that to *its* power over the heart, and to *its* benevolent tendencies, our working men will ultimately have to ascribe their enfranchisement, and will be compelled to acknowledge 'religion has done this;' we do think that such a consummation would deal a heavier blow at socialism and low, ignorant infidelity, than the most austere political Pharisaism in the world. Not by coercion and exclusion shall we be able to stay the enmity of the masses to the cross of Christ. Alas! we have lost our hold upon them, and they are like sheep without a shepherd. But no denunciation of their vices, no expressions of abhorrence, no holding up of our hands in astonishment, no curling of the lip in contempt, no exclamations of 'Stand by thyself,' whether in a temporal or spiritual sense, will avail to win them back. Misguided as they are, they are yet men. Human emotions swell in their bosoms; human susceptibilities have an abiding place in their hearts. If we would lead them, we must win them; if we would win them, we must give them their rights. If we would imbue them with higher principles than any by which they are at present actuated, we must let those principles pour their tide of influence through the only channel by which the ten thousand sons of toil are now accessible. Oh, the vast, the illimitable field open at this moment to British Christians! the career of true glory upon which religion, in this our land, is invited to enter. Those immense tracts of yet unsanctified humanity! shall none reap them? Is there no way to these men's confidence? No inlet whatever to their souls? No means of gathering them about us, that we may point out to them the way to true happiness? Who shall say this? What do they ask? Aught that religion may not grant? No, no! They implore us to 'do unto others as we would they should do unto us.' Complete suffrage is just the development of this sublime rule of conduct in the political world. We long to see those who bind this sentence about their brows, and write it on the hem of their garments, display their faith in it, not merely in the petty, higgling matters of private life, but in the wider sphere, and upon the more elevated stage, of national affairs. We yet hope to hail the day when the professed subjects of the gospel will place less confidence in swords and bayonets, and dare to commit themselves to truth and justice. And whenever it does arrive, as arrive we are convinced it will, then Christianity will appear before our industrious multitudes

in her beautiful garments; and their emancipation, wrought out by the activities of spiritual benevolence, like that of the poor negroes, will be followed by a reverential regard to religion which will prepare them to listen to its message, and bring them once again within the range of Divine truth.

Brief Notices.

The Neighbours: A Story of Every-Day Life. By Frederika Bremer. Translated by Mary Howitt. 2 Vols. London: Longman.

Little is known in this country of the social life of Sweden, and still less of its literature. Mr. Laing's volume has done somewhat to familiarize us with the former, and those now before us will be found to throw considerable light on both. The great charm of *The Neighbours* is the fresh and life-like picture which it furnishes of the domestic economy of Sweden. The scenes it unfolds, the characters it paints, the manners and habits it describes, are at once both original and obviously true to nature, while the sentiments expressed throughout the narrative, are at once amiable and pure, adapted to chasten the heart by rectifying its affections. Those who object to all fictitious narratives, will, of course, throw aside the work as unsuitable to their taste, but others, who commence its perusal, will be compelled to proceed with it throughout, and will possess at the close a more vivid and accurate view of Swedish character and Swedish life than could easily be obtained from any other source. The principal characters are well drawn and are nicely discriminated. Lars Andus and his 'little wife' Franziska, the very image of sprightliness, intelligence, and good feeling; Madame Mansfield, the step-mother of the former, with her proud bearing, and though bruised and shattered, yet thoroughly maternal heart; Bruno her son, like a thunder-cloud, dark and fearful; and Serena, an angel of light, who wins him back from crime and misery,—are all sketched with a masterly hand, and are made to act each his appropriate part in the evolution of the plot. The work here presented to the English reader is one of a series of four by the same author, of all of which Mrs. Howitt remarks—and if we may judge from the specimen before us, remarks truly—'They are most admirable in their lessons of social wisdom, in their life of relation, in their playful humour, and in all those qualities which can make writings acceptable to the fireside circle of the good and refined.' The translator informs us that the other three works, entitled, 'The House,' 'The President's Daughters,' and 'Nina,' are ready for publication, and will speedily follow 'The Neighbours,' if the patronage extended to the last be such as to warrant the undertaking. Of this we can entertain no doubt, as we have seldom met with a work which is more deserving, or more likely to secure the favour of a discerning public.

Damascus; or, Conversion in Relation to the Grace of God and the Agency of Man: an Essay. By David Everard Ford, author of 'Decapolis,' 'Chorazin,' &c. London: Simpkin and Marshall.

Christian Happiness Considered in its Relation to Man, Families, and Churches. By E. Mannering, Holywell Mount Chapel. London: Snow.

Both these little books are full of the spirit and sentiment of the gospel. Damascus is not inferior in adaptation for usefulness to any of Mr. Ford's previous essays. Such appeals, descriptions, and invitations as these books contain, cannot fail, under Divine blessing, to raise the standard of personal religion, and to bring souls to Christ. Their circulation amongst our families, churches, and in the world at large, would be an appropriate task of Christian benevolence.

Sabbath Evening Readings. By the Rev. Denis Kelly, M.A., Minister of Trinity Church, St. Bride's. London: Edwards, 12, Ave-Maria-Lane.

Sabbath Studies upon Life, Death, Incorporeal Existence, The Resurrection, Providence, and Prayer. By the author of 'A Synopsis of the Evidences of Christianity. London: Macardy and Co. 1842.

Mr. Kelly's is a well-arranged, pleasing, and instructive manual for the use of the domestic circle on Sabbath evenings. It presents, in a series of interesting, simple, and brief expositions, many of the most important truths of scripture, and will be found profitable for religious reading. It is addressed to the mind and the heart. The other little book which we have coupled with it, because of similarity in its object, rather than in its style, is a pocket-volume of ninety pages. Its title is not appropriate, and it is deficient in originality and arrangement, but as a statement of religious truth may be useful.

A Course of Lectures on Infidelity. By Ministers of the Church of Scotland in Glasgow and Neighbourhood. Glasgow. Collins.

These lectures are intended as a supplement to some previously delivered and published on the Evidences of Revealed Religion. They exhibit those excellences and defects which usually distinguish the class of writings to which they belong. Our readers will, for the most part, understand what we mean, when we say that they are eminently Scotch, and besides, embody the thoughts and feelings of the Scottish Kirk. Their style and theology are strong and stern, and while attacking infidelity, the authors have mostly some few bugbears of their own, against which they carry on an intermittent and indirect warfare. These are, Arminianism, Sabbath Desecration, and Dissent; not one of which we anticipate will be destroyed by the stray shafts of the lecturers against infidelity. Amongst the productions of so many

minds, there must, of course, be various degrees of merit. Lecture 3, on the past history of infidelity, and lecture 7, containing an exposure of the unphilosophical and irreligious tenets of Socialism in a style of searching and severe irony, appeared to us especially interesting. We were amused with lecture 6, though we protest against many of the principles it advocates. It is a feeble attempt to brand those notions of civil and ecclesiastical liberty, which are generally entertained in the present day, with the name of infidelity, and concludes with a wail over the present condition of the kirk. In a book professedly catholic in its object, we greatly regret that such a lecture should have been introduced. The volume, from its intrinsic merits, as well as the high character of its authors, must command an extensive circulation.

Confessions of an Apostate. By the author of 'Felix de Lisle.' London: Seeley and Burnside.

This little volume has the same design as the previous one, but is in a very different style and manner. It is a religious narrative, we suppose a fiction, illustrating the process by which the mind of many a youth may become gradually inveigled by the sophistries, and seduced by the poetry, of the Romish church. The subject of the narrative is represented as educated partly in Guernsey, thence proceeding to Oxford, embracing Puseyism, travelling in Normandy, converted to Popery, afterwards entering a catholic seminary in England with a view to the priesthood, and thence rescued by too severe a tyranny on the part of his religious superior. It abounds with elegant descriptions of natural beauty, and is similar in style to the author's previous volume, though scarcely prepared with equal care, or of such absorbing interest. Many well-selected quotations are found in it from the works of the tractarians. It is likely to be instructive and pleasing to a large class of readers.

Sabbath School Lectures on the Names, Titles, and Similitudes of the Lord Jesus Christ, in alphabetical order, with a Recommendatory Preface. By the Rev. J. Sherman. London: Ward.

The style of this publication, for the most part, is simple, and it is very likely to interest Sabbath-school children. The truths which it conveys are of the utmost importance. Some of the names and titles are perhaps fanciful, and not sufficiently justified by fair interpretation of the Bible. Of this kind are several taken from Solomon's Song. 'The Brazen Serpent' also is not a title of Christ, and the analogy recorded in John, iii. 14, depends, not on the object, but the action. We suppose that the lectures will be continued, as they have only reached the letter C. With Mr. Sherman we wish well to the undertaking, and commend these lectures to the attention of those who have charge of the religious education of children.

Christianity in the East. By the Rev. W. Buyers, Missionary of the London Society. London: Snow. 1842.

A discourse, according to the author, 'delivered before the directors of the London Missionary Society.' We dislike this phrase. It savours too much of the college exercise, or the royal sermon. The discourse itself abounds with useful information and practical hints, and we thank Mr. Buyers for its publication, as adapted to promote the great cause of Missions.

God's Hand in America. By the Rev. George B. Cheever. *With an Essay.* By the Rev. Dr. Skinner, New York. London: Wiley and Putnam. 1841.

An eloquent description of the moral and religious training, position, and responsibility of the American nation. It is replete with passages of great power and thrilling interest. It is printed in aid of a benevolent object, though what it is we are not informed. The introductory essay contains a sound exposition of the connexion between religion and patriotism. Altogether it is a book which will deeply interest readers on both sides of the Atlantic.

Literary Intelligence.

In the Press.

The Rural and Domestic Life of Germany, with characteristic sketches of its Cities and Scenery. By William Howitt. 8vo.

Illustrations of Scripture from the Geography, Natural History, and Manners and Customs of the East. By the late Professor George Paxton, D.D. Third Edition, revised and greatly enlarged, by Rev. R. Jamieson. Geography, 12mo. Natural History, 12mo.

Progressive Questioning Book, comprising steps I. II. III., or Questions on Mark, Matthew, Luke, and the Acts, intended for the use of Teachers. By the Rev. E. T. M. Phillipps. 12mo.

A Practical Exposition of the Book of Jonah, in Ten Lectures. By James Peddie, D.D.

Use them; or, Gathered Fragments, Missionary Hints, and Anecdotes for the Young. By Mrs. Beddow. Second Edition.

Perseverance Rewarded: a Sequel to 'Use them; or, Gathered Fragments.' By Mrs. Beddow.

Correspondence of John, fourth Duke of Bedford, selected from the Originals at Woburn Abbey, with an Introduction by Lord John Russell. Vol. 1. 8vo.

The Intercommunity of Churches. A Sermon by the Rev. R. W. Hamilton. Published by request of the Congregational Union.

The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie, A.M., Principal of the University of Glasgow, 1637—1662, By David Laing, Esq. Volume 3.

On the Genealogies contained in the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke. By William Beeston, Esq. Third Edition.

The Pictorial History of Shakspere. Part 50. The History of Opinion.

Sermons by the late Rev. Ebenezer Temple, of Rochford, Essex, with a Biographical Sketch of the Author, by his Widow.

Geneveva, a Poem. By Richard Chevenix Trench.

The Poetical Treasury. A Series of Sacred Poems on Subjects selected from each chapter of Matthew and Mark. By Eliza Maskell.

The Nursery Rhymes of England, obtained principally from oral tradition. Collected and edited by James Orchard Halliwell, Esq. Second Edition.

Contribution towards the Exposition of the Book of Genesis. By Robert S. Candlish, D.D.

The Congregational Calendar and Family Almanac for 1843.

Russia and the Russians in 1842. By J. G. Kohl. Vol. II.

The Scenery and Antiquities of Ireland illustrated. Part XIX.

Fox's Book of Martyrs. Edited by Rev. John Cumming, M.A. Part XVIII.

Canadian Scenery Illustrated. Part XXVIII.

Observations on the School Return for the diocese of Bath and Wells, showing the uncharitable Nature and Puseyite tendency of some of the questions contained therein. By Rev. Thomas Spencer, M.A.

The Great Physician: the connexion of Diseases and Remedies with the Truths of Revelation. By John Gardner, Surgeon.

The Eastern and Western States of America. By J. S. Buckingham, Esq. 3 vols.

Holy Songs and Musical Prayers, composed or adapted for four voices, with an accompaniment for the Pianoforte or Organ. By J. R. Ogden.

Hymns for the Christian Church and Home. Collected and edited by James Martineau.

The Vicar of Wakefield. By Oliver Goldsmith. With Thirty-two Illustrations by William Mulready, R.A. 8vo.

The Voice of Christ to the Churches, considered in a course of Twenty-one Lectures, expository and practical, on the Second and Third Chapters of the Book of the Revelation. By Ebenezer Miller, M.A.

Catholic and Evangelical Principles viewed in their application to the Church of God, in a series of letters to a friend. By Alfred Barrett.

Danger and Duty; or a Few Words on the present state of the times, and in behalf of righteousness, truth, and peace. By Rev. Richard Marks, Great Missenden.

The Charge of the Bishop of London examined, and its Unscriptural Tendency set forth. By one of the Laity.

Characteristics of Puseyism. A Sermon by Rev. H. J. Bevis. Published by request.

The Hall of Vision: a View of Principles. A Poem, in Three Books, with Minor Poems. By William Leask.

The Approaching Downfall of Popery and Civil Despotism in Europe. By a Layman.

A Private Journal kept during the Niger Expedition, from the commencement of May, 1841, till June, 1842. By William Simpson.

Sacred Lyrics. By Richard Hine, M.D.

Cottage Comforts, with hints for promoting them. Gleaned from Experience, and enlivened with Anecdotes. By Esther Copley. Seventeenth Edition, revised and enlarged.

Elements of Language and General Grammar. By George Payne, LL.D.

The Scottish Ecclesiastical Register and National Almanac for 1843.

THE

ECLECTIC REVIEW

For FEBRUARY, 1843.

Art. I. 1. *The Church of Scotland's Claim of Right; to which are prefixed the Speeches of Dr. Chalmers, Dr. Gordon, and Mr. Dunlop, in the General Assembly in support of the same, May* 24, 1842.

2. *Memorial submitted to the Right Hon. Sir Robert Peel, &c., adopted by a meeting of Ministers of the Church of Scotland, assembled at Edinburgh, on the* 17*th and* 24*th Nov.* 1842.

The affairs of the Church of Scotland still occupy a large share of public attention; and when we reflect on the number and influence of the parties directly interested—on the zeal, the energy, and the ability, which the most distinguished ministers of the Scottish church have expended in these transactions—on the incessant appeals to public notice which they have made for years, from the press, from the pulpit, from the platform, from the stirring arena of their church courts, especially of their General Assembly,—and, we may add, on their hitherto interminable litigation with the courts of law, and their multifarious negotiations with the leading members of the senate, and of the government, we need not wonder that in all parts of the empire it is eagerly inquired by many, what is the real position of the Scottish church, and what are the probable results of that position? It is not easy to decide on the second of these queries; we mean to assist our readers in obtaining an answer to the first.

We persuade ourselves that it will not be difficult to show, that while these events must be chiefly interesting to the members of the northern establishment, it does not become either the members of the English church, or dissenters in any part of the empire, to be indifferent to them. We assume that nothing materially affecting one section of the Christian church ought to

be regarded lightly by any other section. It is not necessary for us to bear our testimony to the talent, and unquestioned piety of not a few, both among the ministers and the private members of the church, whom these proceedings directly affect; nor, we suppose, would it be going too far to affirm, that a larger proportion of active and decided piety is understood to appear among those called the non-intrusion party, or, to speak more correctly, the sections into which that party is broken, than among that more compact phalanx to which they are opposed. To the interests of so many brethren in Christ, Christians around cannot be apathetic. Besides, the church of Scotland is a British institution, as well as the Church of England, and, like the latter, recognised by the laws, and supported by the treasury of the country. Dissenters have much more to do with these churches than they wish. Their patriotism and their pockets are alike affected by the circumstances of either establishment; and, indeed, the extent to which the welfare of dissenting churches, the sacred cause of liberty, civil and religious, the spiritual interests of the British people, the honour of Christianity, and the glory of our Redeemer, are all affected by the position and the influence of the established churches, it is not easy fully to estimate. Our readers are aware, too, that the aid of dissenters, both in Scotland and England, has been eagerly entreated by the non-intrusionists of Scotland; and before dissenters can accede to these requests, with intelligent and conscientious cordiality, they must understand the matters at issue, no very facile attainment, we confess, as both senators and the Queen's ministers, and even practised lawyers, very readily acknowledge. It is our conviction, however, that dissenters will permit no unkind feeling to be drawn forth, on their parts, towards the pious ministers and members of the Scottish church at this juncture. They are in circumstances of difficulty, solicitude, and temptation; and they are fit objects of our generous fraternal sympathy, and of our fervent prayers. As we judge, their chief difficulties are of their own making; their own hands have planted and reared that thorny thicket in which they are now entangled; besides, they most unduly exaggerate their perils, imagining they are swimming in some abyss, when, if they would but stretch their limbs, they would feel the bottom. We are persuaded that unconscious prejudice prevents them from turning their eyes, with any satisfaction, to that plain path-way to immediate enlargement, of which so many have happily availed themselves, and which is as accessible to them as to others. Still they think not so; and while we cannot cease to expostulate, and even to censure, we must do so in the spirit of patience, forbearance, and charity.

After all that has been said and written on the subject, it is still necessary to answer the question, Who are the non-intrusionists? If you take the answer from themselves, they are '*the church and people of Scotland.*' Or, if they are not so *constituently*, they are so *representatively*, and in effect. This is the constant language of Dr. Chalmers, the acknowledged head and leader of the party. It is unnecessary to show, by quotations from speeches and pamphlets, that in this imposing style Dr. Chalmers is followed by those whom he leads. It will suffice to refer to this 'claim of right,' in which, with unenviable boldness, its authors present their 'claim,' '*in name*, and on behalf of this church, *and of the nation and people of Scotland.*' We affirm, on the other hand, that this is not prose, but poetry, an exemplification of that figure of speech by which a part is put for the whole. It is not narrative, it is fiction; a fiction in a *quasi* legal document. It is true the document seems to be drawn up by a lawyer; but it was sanctioned and adopted by the venerable assembly itself. No, no; the non-intrusionists are neither the church nor nation of Scotland; a minority even of the former, certainly a small section of the latter, as the following facts will show. First, the Church of Scotland, is certainly numerous and influential, but is still only a party in Scotland. Again, the non-intrusionists are but a section of this party; and the recent convocation has brought to light very unpleasant facts as to the comparative numbers of the staunch men of this party, even among the clergy. There are upwards of 1200 ministers in the Scottish church, having churches or chapels, and the convocation never numbered more than 478, while not more than from 250 to 300 ministers of parishes made up their minds to adhere to the second set of resolutions, such as they are. No doubt this fact is regarded as a triumph, in point of numbers, by their clerical opponents. From the non-intrusionists, then, we have to deduct, first, the whole body of their avowed opponents; next, a considerable section, represented by such men as Dr. Muir of Edinburgh, who seem to act with neither party; and, finally, a section of clerical seceders from the more rigid non-intrusionists, politely designated by their former friends, 'the forty thieves.'

Such is the comparative strength of the party as composed of the clergy; the proportion of the people, within the church, is probably, much smaller. The landed proprietors of the country are confessedly hostile. Indeed, a large majority of the great landlords are episcopalians; and Sir George Sinclair, an avowed non-intrusionist, affirms that 'they have alienated from their cause, and from their party, at least 49-50ths of the patrons, by whom they, and all their adherents, are regarded as systematic violators of the civil law, and pragmatical disturbers of the national

peace.'* The legal profession, throughout the whole land, may be understood as fairly represented by the proportion of judges in the Court of Session, who deem the principles and practices of the party, arrogant, illegal, and rebellious. The newspapers may be referred to as indicating the sentiments of their readers among all classes; and, with the exception of four or five such journals, very limited both in circulation and influence, except among the non-intrusion brethren, they are all hostile. The municipal councils, the parliamentary electors in town and country, in short, every other test of numbers that, without a census, can be referred to, leave the non-intrusionists a small Scottish minority. Even the congregations of the clergy of this class, not excepting those of the most able and faithful, are the reverse of unanimous; and the apathy of the people is now matter of bitter lamentation in the leading journals of the party. Dr. Chalmers himself scarcely overstates the case, in the speech prefixed to 'the claim,' when he complains of the very extensive derision of which his friends are now the objects. 'In short, men of all classes and degrees are beginning to look upon the church,' (he means one section of one church) 'as they would upon a play-ground or unprotected common, where in holiday exemption from the dull routine of their ordinary callings, they might enter with unlicensed footsteps, and hold their saturnalia.'† A fit measurement, by Dr. Chalmers' own rule, of the dimensions and strength of his party! A woful shrinking of the body, magniloquently denominated 'the church and people of Scotland!' In good sooth, were these latter expressions literal and veritable, it were time that England was on the alert, as if the bold northerns, from Berwick to Cape Wrath, were pouring down from their mountains, and swarming on their plains; as if city and country, with 'claim' on their banners, were marshalled for conflict, as if some Bruce of Bannockburn were again up against England and her chivalry. In place of a nation roused, never was nation more at rest, as far as this cause of strife is in question. It is an affair of some 400 or 500 clergymen, endowed and unendowed, three or four of them, perhaps, captains of thousands, a few captains of hundreds, but the greater number captains of fifties, or captains of tens.

It is no small praise of the pamphlet with which we have headed this article, that it serves to bring before us, within a short space, and in an unquestionable form, (as far as one side is concerned) the points now at issue betwixt this party, and the highest legal tribunals in the land. Dr. Chalmers, in his speech, alludes to the words attributed to Sir Robert Peel, complaining of the voluminous perplexity of the questions submitted to him,

* Correspondence of Sir G. Sinclair, p. 186. † Speech, p. 9.

as including not only 'the different judgments pronounced in the Court of Session, and the decision of the House of Lords,' but also 'many pamphlets which had been written on the subject;' to which Sir Robert might have added the learned written opinions of the judges, the pleadings before them, and the speeches of the leaders on both sides, in the church courts. Dr. Chalmers speaks emphatically of 'a weary and voluminous controversy,' which, it is thought, 'must be traversed, ere the part which the church has borne in this transaction can become at all intelligible.'* A pilgrimage, which, in these days of rapid movement, few will be willing to undertake, and in preference to which, the Doctor judges there is a shorter cut, by which, without taking many steps, or wasting much time, one may arrive at the knowledge of the truth. We think with Dr. Chalmers, and much as we have at different times put ourselves to the trouble of reading on these vexed and barren questions, we do think that this pamphlet—we do not say, contains sufficient information for the uninitiated, very far from it—but goes far to put into the hands of a scholar in this department of ecclesiastical lore, a valuable syllabus of the chief points in the controversy. The speech of Dr. Chalmers promises little, and the Dr. must forgive us for saying, fulfils less than it promises, except in as far as it is not altogether consistent with itself.† That of Dr. Gordon neither promises nor imparts anything, save the general opinion of that good and grave man; but Mr. Dunlop, in his speech, circumscribes no inconsiderable portion of the desired space; while the document, proceeding, one would think, from the pen of this lawyer, condenses so many facts, and abounds with so many references, as put it in the power of any patient man, with some pains, and some sacrifice of leisure, to approach to the mastery of the whole subject. We shall do what we can to put our readers in possession of these matters, and shall add such remarks as the case seems to require.

The two leading points, then, demanded by the claimants, as

* Speech, p. 4.

† An amusing example of this inconsistency occurs in the Doctor's stoutly denying that the church *eats the bread of the state*. 'Sir, we are not eating the bread of the state!' This occurs in the same speech in which, with high approbation, he quotes from Lord Kames, a passage which shews that the temporalities of the church are so entirely from the state, that 'it belongs to the civil court to judge whether the minister be entitled to the stipend, and the Court of Session will find that a minister, wrongously settled' (by the Church Courts) 'is not entitled to the stipend.' The very document, too, 'the claim,' which the Doctor moved, has these words, 'the jurisdiction of secular tribunals, whose determination as to *all temporalities conferred by the state upon the church*, this church hath ever admitted, and doth admit, to be exclusive and ultimate.'* Yet the church is not eating the bread of the state!

* Speech, p. 8. Claim, p. 2.

matters of right, are, in short, *non-intrusion* and *spiritual independence*. By the former, they mean, that a minister shall never be inducted into a parish contrary to the will of the people; and by the latter, that the church courts shall be uncontrolled by the state and the courts of law, in all their proceedings respecting spiritual things, such as the administration of the word and the sacraments, the trial, ordination, or deprivation of ministers, and all spiritual discipline. In support of the former, they hold, not only that it is in itself right that the members of the church should have some voice in the appointment of their pastors, but that the doctrine of the Church of Scotland has been, from the beginning, 'that no pastor be intruded on any congregation contrary to the will of the people,' and that this sacred non-intrusion principle was both acted upon by the church, who never inducted a minister till he had 'received a call from the people over whom he was to be appointed,' and until 'such call had been sustained by the church courts;' but also, that the church having been established with such a principle in her constitution and practice, that principle has been sanctioned by the state as really as by the church. In support of *spiritual independence* they hold that it has been a principle incorporated with the constitution of the Church of Scotland, and most expressly taught in her standards, that 'there is no other head of the church but the Lord Jesus Christ,' who 'hath appointed a government in the hand of church officers, distinct from the civil magistrate,' which government includes the administration of all ordinances, discipline among the rest; and that the books which contain this doctrine have been repeatedly and solemnly sanctioned by civil statute. On these grounds they 'claim as of right,' that the church 'shall freely possess and enjoy her liberties, government, discipline, rights and privileges, according to law, especially for the defence of the spiritual liberties of her people, and that she shall be protected therein from unconstitutional and illegal encroachments,' alleged to have been made 'by the Court of Session, and her people secured in their constitutional rights and liberties.' Further, 'they declare that they cannot, in accordance with the word of God, the authorised and ratified standards of this church, and the dictates of their consciences, intrude ministers on reclaiming congregations, or carry on the government of Christ's church, subject to the coercion attempted by the Court of Session . . . and that, at the risk and hazard of suffering the loss of the secular benefits conferred by the state, and the public advantages of an establishment, they must, as by God's grace they will, refuse so to do: for, highly as they estimate these, they cannot put them in competition with the inalienable liberties of a church of Christ, which, alike by their duty and allegiance to

their head and king, and by their ordination vows, they are bound to maintain, notwithstanding of whatever trouble or persecution may arise.'* Such is the 'claim.' In a short paragraph that follows, they 'protest' that all statutes of the kingdom, and decisions of courts of law, hostile to these rights of the church, 'are in themselves void and null, and of no legal force or effect,' and that their submission to such statutes, 'in so far, though in so far only as these may regard civil rights and privileges . . . shall not be deemed an acquiescence therein, but that it shall be free to the members of this church, or their successors, at any time hereafter, when there shall be a prospect of obtaining justice, to claim the restitution of all such civil rights and privileges, and temporal benefits and endowments, as for the present they may be compelled to yield up,' &c.†

We must now advert to the circumstances which gave origin to this 'claim of right.' At first sight the demands of the non-intrusion party seem altogether reasonable, and that without invading their vested rights, fenced on all sides by the statutes of the land, the courts of law could not annoy them. The church inserts in her constitutional books the principles of non-intrusion and spiritual independence; the state sanctions these books, and supports and protects the church in acting on these principles for ages. On what pretence, then, can the courts of law, or the legislature itself, now oppress the church, in honestly acting out her own constitutional and acknowledged principles?

Unfortunately, however, this *prima facie* and *ex-parte* view of the case will not bear close examination. On inquiry into the constitution and proceedings of the Church of Scotland, it will be found that these are as ambiguous and inconsistent as even lawyers could wish to render them; that they are intrusionist and non-intrusionist, independent and dependent, almost alike; and that somewhat in the fashion of our Anglican formularies, which are partly protestant, partly catholic, and to which the one party and the other may in common appeal, so the friends of non-intrusion and their opponents can both quote, and quote correctly, parts of the same standards to suit their respective objects, with this balance, we fear, in favour of the latter, that usage, in law so fatal, seems decidedly in their favour.

Let us see. We think it may be affirmed with confidence, that 'the Christian people,' as they have been denominated, *never had the unfettered choice of their pastors in the Church of Scotland, from the era of the Reformation in* 1560, *to the passing of the existing veto law in* 1834, *and that even that law concedes no such privilege.* When the parliament, in 1560, abolished popery, and legalized the reformed faith, it assigned, within a few years

* Claim, p. 13. † Ibid.

after, these two,—Romish patronage, and Romish revenues,—to the reformed church, enacting that 'the presentation of laic patronages should always be reserved to *the just and ancient patrons.*' In this decision of the state, the church submissively acquiesced, conceiving apparently, that she had made a favourable bargain in obtaining state pay by submission to state patronage. With grateful joy for such a settlement, the assembly of that year wrote to an exiled superintendent, inviting him to return, and stating, for his encouragement, 'that a godly magistrate was now invested with supreme power—that religion was established and flourishing throughout the realm—*that sufficient provision was appointed for ministers*—and that he would now see *the cope stone of that work* whereof he had laid the foundation.'* In the restless period that immediately followed, repeated statutes in confirmation of patronage were made, until in 1592, when the Presbyterian polity was formally introduced and sanctioned, and the statute, so celebrated in the past history of the Scottish church, and in her more recent contentions, as the very '*palladium*' of her civil securities and immunities, was obtained from the legislature. This statute concludes with appointing 'all presentations to benefices to be directed to the particular Presbyteries in all time coming, to give collation thereupon, and to put order to all matters and causes ecclesiastical within their bounds, according to the discipline of the Kirk, *providing the foresaid Presbyteries be bound and restricted to receive and admit any qualified minister, presented by his Majesty or laic patrons.*' Among the many ecclesiastical changes of the subsequent years, the law of patronage remained unchanged, until the interregnum, when, in 1649, it was formally abolished by an act of the Scottish parliament, but was restored with the Restoration. At the Revolution, patronage was abolished; or rather, as remarked by Lord Moncrieff, in his evidence on patronage before a committee of the House of Commons, was taken from one and vested in a few; the arrangement being, that the nomination to the benefice, in place of the 'just and ancient patrons,' should henceforth be with 'the heritors and elders of the parish.' Finally, this settlement was revoked by Parliament in 1711, when 'the just and ancient patrons' were restored to plenary power, and 'the Presbytery is *hereby obliged* to receive and admit, in the same manner, such qualified person or persons, minister or ministers, as shall be presented by the respective patrons.'

Such were the enactments *of the state* in regard to the rights of the people, and the liberty or power of the church, from 1567 to 1834; amounting to this, that no church should have a pastor but such as the patron might be pleased to present, and that the

* Dr. Cook's Plain Observations, p. 7.

church was 'bound and astricted,' by parliamentary statute, to bow to 'these rights of the just and ancient patrons.' But what were the declared sentiments of the church itself; and in what manner did the church act in favour of popular liberty? A few facts will supply the answer to these queries. The 'First Book of Discipline' was prepared by the reformers in 1560, but never received the sanction of the state; and in this work this great principle is laid down, 'it appertaineth to the people, and to every several congregation, to *elect* their own ministers.' Yet this principle, just and bold in itself, was trammeled, or rather nullified, (at least, when congregations delayed for '*forty days*' to elect a minister) by the good men who propounded it; for they add that, 'if his doctrine were found wholesome, and able to instruct the simple, and if the church (the ministers) justly could reprehend nothing in his life, doctrine, nor utterance, then the church, which before was destitute, was to be judged unreasonable, if they were to refuse him *whom the church* (*the ministers*) *did offer;* and they should be *compelled,* by the censure of the council and church, to receive the person appointed and approved by the judgment of the godly and learned.'* This was giving with the left hand and taking with the right, and was virtually placing the whole power of election, as well as subsequent induction, in the hands of the clergy. For, first, the person to be elected is, in the cases specified, first *offered by the church,* the church thus placing herself, by her own act, in the room of the patron who presents—next, the church (the clergy) were the sole judges, self-constituted, whether 'the church which before was destitute, was '*unreasonable,*' in its rejection of the clerically offered candidate; and, finally, if these 'godly and learned men' who *offered* the candidate, find that the vacant church rejects unreasonably their nominee, they subject these 'unreasonable' men to the *compulsion* of power, secular and religious, to submit to their lordly authority. Was this non-intrusion?'

In the 'Second Book of Discipline,' which was prepared in 1578, the reformers advance a little. On the one hand, in regard to patronage, they unqualifiedly condemn it, as 'used in the pope's kirk . . . flowing from the pope, and corruption of the canon law . . . having no ground in the word of God, but contrary to the same;' but on the other, they drop the principle, that the people should elect, and affirm that 'election is the choosing out of a person, or persons, to the office that *vakes* (becomes vacant), by the *judgment* of the eldership (the presbytery) and consent of the congregation, to which the person or persons shall be appointed.'* The people have still no liberty of unfettered elec-

* First Book of Discipline.

tion conceded to them here; and although patronage is condemned in words, it is in fact endured, in the same spirit which a few years before brought this slavish language from the assembly itself,—'our mind is not that her Majesty or any other patron should be divested of their just patronage.'†

In 1649, when the *quasi* parliament abolished patronage, as 'an evil bondage,' having 'no warrant in the word of God,' but 'a custom merely popish,' and 'prejudicial to the liberty of the people,' and to 'the free-calling and entry of ministers unto their charge;' and when presbyteries were authorized, to 'proceed to the planting of a kirk upon the suit and calling of the congregation, on whom none is to be intruded against their will,' how did the church act? They appointed that the election should *not* be vested in the people, but in *the session* (the elders)—'the session shall meet and proceed to the election,' thus giving to a few a greater power than was ever vested in the patrons. The congregation, however, were to have the power of assenting to, or dissenting from, the election of the elders. If they assented, all was well; if they dissented, the presbytery were to judge of their reasons, and if these reasons were good, they were sustained; but if, in the judgment of the presbytery, they were 'grounded on causeless prejudice,' they were overruled. And thus were the poor people, betwixt the elders and the presbyters, jostled out of their previously acknowledged right of election. In this notable act, it is added, that 'where the congregation,' in the estimation of the presbytery, 'is disaffected and malignant,' they are to be treated without even the previous ceremony,—'in that case, the presbytery is to provide them with a minister.'

In regard to the settlement of 1592, it is enough to say of the sentiments of the church, that the Act fixing that settlement is up to this day regarded as the church's 'charter,'—the 'binding and astricting' clause notwithstanding. Similar remarks apply to the settlement of 1690. No *wish* was expressed by the clergy to grant unfettered election to the people. Says a recent writer, 'the clergy wished to have the Act 1649 back again, putting the election of ministers into the hands of the elders nominally, but really into their own hands;' and, he adds, in the words of the late Sir Henry Moncrieff, 'it was thought not expedient to give the clergy the influence which, in whatever form it was exercised, they really possessed before the usurpation of Cromwell, *and still less to place any power in the great body of the people*, which would interfere with the right of election. King William's advisers followed a middle course between these extremes.

* Second Book of Discipline, chapters 3 and 12.
† Rose's Humble Attempt, p. 7.

Though their arrangement was certainly suggested by the former practice, it was, in a great measure, free from its chief disadvantages. In place of the presbytery, it gave the original power of nomination to the benitors and elders of the parish.'*

It is proper to state that a *call* has been a usage in the Church of Scotland, and continues to be so. The call is a written invitation to the person presented to become pastor of the parish. The presbytery orders a meeting of the congregation to be held, at which, after religious services, the call is read, and laid down for signature by such of the members as choose; but the proceedings in order to the induction, and the induction itself, are in no degree influenced by the number of signatures appended to the call. Confessedly, it is of no value, any farther than as it affords an opportunity to the members of the church to welcome the presentee, if he is acceptable. To render the subscription of the call by a majority of the members necessary in order to the induction, would be held, as is universally admitted by the civil courts, an invasion of the rights both of patron and presentee, at least equal in amount to the veto.

We now come to the important era of the veto. Before that period considerable excitement had prevailed on the subject of patronage, always an object of popular dislike; and anti-patronage societies had been formed, and countenanced by such men as the late Dr. A. Thomson, Dr. Dickson, and some of the most justly esteemed ministers of the national church. These societies contemplated the exposure of the evils of the system of patronage, petitions to parliament for its abolition, and, in the meantime, raising funds for the purchase of patronages, and the consequent relief of parishes. The strength of this party, on trial in the Assembly, was found to be numerically small; and, although it succeeded in obtaining a valuable mass of evidence on the subject, in the report of the committee of the House of Commons, before which this evidence was taken, the societies soon fell off, and died a natural death. But the voluntary controversy so overspread the country, combining in its favour, with a few exceptions, dissenters of every name, and so invaded the church itself, that the petitions to parliament for the separation of church and state were subscribed by churchmen in thousands. It was necessary to do something, to use a phrase of Dr. Chalmers, we think, 'to popularise the establishment,' and there were two measures adopted with this view. The first of these was changing the ecclesiastical status of a large body of the clergy. The number of parochial ministers was, at this time, under a thousand; the number of parishes, having for the most part but one minister for each, being about nine hundred and thirty. But

* Rose's Humble Attempt, p. 17.

there were from sixty to seventy chapels of ease, about forty 'parliamentary churches' in the highlands and islands, and a rapidly growing number of 'church-extension chapels.' The ministers in all these had no parish, no government endowment (with the exception of the forty above designated), and no right to sit as ministers in Presbytery, Synod, or General Assembly. Of its own accord, and without legal sanction, the Assembly assigned to all these ministers defined districts for sacred superintendence, which they called *parishes quoad sacra*, (to distinguish them from the old parishes, *quoad civilia*, the latter only having, legally provided, manses, glebe, and *tiend*, or tithe), and allowed them to sit and vote in the church courts equally with their *quoad civilia* brethren. This arrangement of the Assembly has served to multiply its embarrassments; for it, too, is now under the consideration of the judges; and probably before this article goes to press, a sentence will be given annihilating the new status of the *quoad sacra* men, as *ultra vives* of the Assembly to grant; and rendering legally null and void every sentence of Presbytery, Synod, or Assembly, in which a *quoad sacra* vote has been suffered to mingle.

The veto law was next passed, and as this celebrated and ill-fated measure is the main source of that flood of evil which has well nigh overrun the Church of Scotland, and as it is both important and short, we give the document entire.

'Edinburgh, May 31, 1834.—The General Assembly declare that it is a fundamental law of this church, that no pastor shall be intruded on any congregation contrary to the will of the people; and, in order that this principle may be carried into full effect, the General Assembly, with the consent of a majority of the Presbyteries of the church, do declare, enact, and ordain, That it shall be an instruction to Presbyteries, that if, in the moderating in a call to a vacant pastoral charge, the major part of the male heads of families, members of the vacant congregation, and in full communion with the church, shall disapprove of the person in whose favour the call is proposed to be moderated in, such disapproval shall be deemed sufficient ground for the Presbytery rejecting such person, and that he shall be rejected accordingly, and due notice thereof forthwith given to all concerned; but that, if the major part of the said heads of families shall not disapprove of such person to be their pastor, the Presbytery shall proceed with the settlement according to the rules of the church; and further declare, that no person shall be held to be entitled to disapprove as aforesaid, who shall refuse, if required, solemnly to declare, in presence of the Presbytery, that he is actuated by no factious or malicious motive, but solely by a conscientious regard to the spiritual interests of himself or the congregation.'

Such is the veto law; but does this law concede popular rights? To a few it grants, to the many it denies them. 'It

appertaineth to *the people*, and to *every several congregation* to elect their own ministers.' This is their own principle in their own words. *But the veto law, in place of 'carrying out this principle into full effect,' is a denial of all proper election to every congregation under the inspection of the General Assembly.* For, in the first place, the people can in no instance *originate* an election. The patron must, in every case, first appoint, ere the people are permitted to act. Then, the power conceded to the people is *not to elect*, but *simply to reject*, and to wait with patience for another appointment. Finally, this power of rejection is not given to the majority even of the communicants, but, in every instance, *to a minority*—'male heads of families'—excluding all female members, who are the majority in almost every church; excluding the most intelligent and pious of the adult youth in communion with the church; excluding all male or female domestics. It may be fairly questioned, whether a measure more whimsically capricious, more arbitrary, more exactly at variance with those popular rights for which professedly they were contending, can be found in the cumbrous statute books of the church of Scotland. 'We have muzzled patronage,' said one of the valiant supporters of this measure. With much point Dr. M'Crie remarked, 'They have only *muffled* patronage, and *muzzled* the people.'* Yet the veto law was passed by the Assembly, constituted in the name of Christ, and defended as an achievement of that spiritual independence, with which it is impiety for even the law of the land to intermeddle! Had it been fathered on that grave and sober judge, Lord Moncrieff, or ranked among the ephemeral creations of the genius and fancy of Dr. Chalmers, and adopted fondly by the majority of the Assembly from respect to its parentage, it had been better. For Dr. Chalmers himself soon discovered that the veto law was but *a blunder*, and solemnly counselled, 'as the first step of an outgoing' of the church from her difficulties, 'to repeal the veto law' so lately and so solemnly passed! And why? 'Had we known beforehand that we should thereby incur *the loss of the temporalities* in every parish where it was carried into

* The veto law was an ecclesiastical recognition of patronage, inasmuch as the veto on the patron's appointment recognised his power to appoint. Indeed, it has been openly pleaded in the General Assembly as an extenuation of the evil charged on the veto, that it was honestly intended to preserve patronage; and as to popular rights, one of the evangelical party who was a member of the Assembly, asserts that 'Dr. Chalmers, Lord Moncrieff, and other eminent members of the Church of Scotland who supported it (the veto) avowed their enmity to popular election, and their desire for the continuance of patronage, under the smallest possible check by the people, such as the veto act would give them.'* Truly the people would need to have their 'claim of right' against the invasion of the clergy; as the latter urge theirs against the inroads of the law.

* Rose, p. 26.

effect, *we should not have enacted it:* but we know this now,' &c.* Very graphic indeed! It is pitiable to think that for not obeying this blunder, but abiding by the former usage of the church and the law of the land, the general assembly have been launching forth their highest censures, all in the name, and by the authority of the blessed Redeemer. Yet if the general assembly shall follow the counsel of Dr. Chalmers, the law will be revoked in the same great name in which it was passed, and similar censures must be awarded, in the same name also, against those who shall then keep, as now against those who break this sacred veto enactment. We say these things more in shame and grief than in anger; but assuredly we need not wonder that such measures proved the prelude of those inextricable perplexities in which so many good men now find themselves entangled.

It will thus appear to our readers, that from the inconsistencies on the subject of non-intrusion to be found in the principles and actings of the church, she laid herself open to the visitations of the law by this veto act. It would altogether exceed our limits to sketch even an outline of these tremendous visitations. They are succinctly given in the preamble to the 'claim,' and in the speech of Mr. Dunlop. The Auchterarder case came up first. Lord Kinnoul, as patron, presented a Mr. Young to the vacant parish. A majority of the male heads of families *vetoed* him, to employ a new Scotch verb. The presbytery refused to take him on trial with a view to his induction, and by virtue of the new powers with which the assembly had invested them, set aside the presentation. Lord Kinnoul and Mr. Young bring the matter before the Scottish judges, who declare the veto to be an illegal act, *ultra vives* of the assembly, an infraction of the civil rights both of patron and presentee, and order the presbytery to take the usual steps for the examination of Mr. Young, and his induction, if they find him qualified. On the church appealing to the House of Lords, their lordships affirm the sentence of the judges in Scotland. The presbytery, with the sanction of the assembly, oppose the law, declaring the decision of the judges illegal. After long suspense, the aggrieved parties demand *legal damages* of the refractory presbytery; and these are awarded, first by the Scottish court, and next, on appeal by the House of Lords. It is this last sentence which has burst like a bomb in the defenceless camp of the non-intrusion brethren, and no wonder; for, it is thought, the damages to be immediately fixed, may amount to 15,000*l.*, a ruinous mulct on the poor presbyters located in the villages and moors around Auchterarder.

* 'What ought the church and people of Scotland to do now?'—p. 46.

Next came Strathbogie, of which all the world has heard. Mr. Edwards was presented to the parish of Marnoch, in Strathbogie presbytery. Not being quite a favourite, the 'male heads' compliment him with their veto; but a majority of the presbytery having been hostile to that measure, refuse to set aside Mr. Edwards on that ground, and ultimately, in compliance with civil, and defiance of ecclesiastical authority, induct Mr. Edwards into the parish of Marnoch. These bold northerns are first suspended, and then deposed by the church; but, under the shelter of the law, they continue to exercise their offices, to hold church, manse, and living, and to transact business as a presbytery. Ministers are sent by the assembly to preach in the parishes of these refractory members; they are interdicted by the civil courts, but preach in spite of the interdicts. Several ministers of the moderate party assist at the communion those deposed clergymen, receive the sacred symbols from their hands, and in turn administer them to their excommunicated friends. The assembly visit these irregularities with a gentle censure, but only as the precursor of higher, if the offences are not repented of, or are repeated. A whole synod receive as members some of those whom the assembly had deposed; and if the non-intrusionists retain their places and their influence, wholesale depositions must be the result. 'It is well known that a large minority of the church's office-bearers are prepared, in obedience to the civil court, to cast off her authority; and were the church, while continuing to claim the advantages secured to her by law, to persevere, *as she must in principle do*, in maintaining *her discipline over all* who, under whatever civil sanction and compulsion, transgress her orders, and violate her laws, founded, as she believes, on the word of God, not only would she be exposed to grievous obloquy and reproach, but a spectacle both painful and scandalous must, in all probability, be exhibited, of two sections of the same church, striving with one another in the use of civil pains on the one hand, and spiritual censures on the other.'* This may suffice on the claim of non-intrusion.

Let us next advert to the collateral claim *of spiritual independence*. By this, as we have seen, is meant, that while they are subject to the state in all civil things, and while the state may give or withhold the temporalities, the church, in all her judgments respecting spiritual things, shall be exempt from legal or state control, and subject alone to Christ, from whom they affirm they have derived their powers. They do not affect to draw the line very exactly betwixt *the sacred* and *the civil*, in a church constituted by law; but the veto law supplied an example

* Memorial, pp. 23, 24.

of their claim, both as they understand it, and as it was viewed by the civil judges; the church claiming it as her right in the exercise of her inalienable spiritual independence, to pass that law, and to deal out all the censures to which it had given occasion: the legal tribunals reminding her of her status as an established church; of the civil statutes under which she is constituted, and to which she must adhere; and of the power of the civil law to restrain her from violating the statutes which bind her, and to treat her like other offenders if she do. The claim itself is thus stated by the non-intrusionists:—'The church . . . has received her powers of internal spiritual government directly from her divine Head, and she must herself at all times exercise the whole of it under a sacred and inviolable responsibility to Him alone, so that she has *no power* to fetter herself by a connexion with the state or otherwise, in the just exercise of any part of her spiritual functions.'* And it is undeniable, as is shown in the memorial, that this high ground has been taken by the church of Scotland *in words*, from her beginning. Thus, in the Second Book of Discipline, 'This power ecclesiastical flows immediately from God and the Mediator, Jesus Christ, and is spiritual, not having a temporal head on earth; but only Christ, the only spiritual King and Governor of his church.'† Thus, also, in the Confession of Faith, 'The Lord Jesus, as King and Head of his church, hath therein appointed a government in the hand of church officers, distinct from the civil magistrate.'‡ And the memorialists hold that 'these principles have been, at various periods, expressly recognised and sanctioned by the state, as the principles upon which she is established, and under which she holds her endowments, and the other immunities of her establishment.'§ To this spiritual independence of the church more importance seems to be attached than even to the non-intrusion principle, on the ground, that if it is surrendered, her whole liberty is surrendered, and for Christ as her Lord, she has the state; and that if this independence is preserved to her, she will, of herself, secure their rights to the people. How far the latter would be safe in her hands, the preceding facts show; and Dr. Chalmers may be regarded as declaring the sense of his party on the other head, in the following emphatic words:—'We regard the spiritual independence of the church as far the most important,—nay, as the only vital question in this controversy.'‖ We believe him firmly.

But has the church no antagonist principles here as well as on popular election? And whether has the practice of the church

* Memorial, p. 5. † Ibid. p. 6. ‡ Cong. ch. xxx. 1.
§ Memorial, p. 7. ‖ 'What ought the church to do?'—p. 35.

favoured the independent or dependent theory? These questions are of easy solution. In the Westminster Confession, which assuredly was not less favourable to ecclesiastical liberty than any preceding documents of the church, and which received as fully the sanction of the state (the Scottish legislature) as the church could wish; we have the following words:—'The civil magistrate . . . hath authority, and it is his duty, to take order that unity and peace be preserved in the church, that the truth of God be kept pure and entire, that all blasphemies and heresies be suppressed, all corruptions and abuses in worship and discipline prevented or reformed, and all the ordinances of God duly settled, administered and observed. For the better effecting whereof, he hath power to call synods, to be present at them, and to provide that whatever is transacted in them be according to the mind of God.'* Truly, the Scottish judges, and the Peers of England, must be ill to please, if they are not satisfied with the power over the church, which, of its own accord, the church thus assigns to them by divine right.

And what has been the uniform usage of the church? Look how it was at first constituted. By acts of the civil legislature. Is this creation by the state, independence of the state? The state legalizes their creed, and grants them their pay, just as it does with the navy or army. Is this independence? Consider the history of this independent church. It is first made presbyterian by the state, then episcopalian, then presbyterian over again—yes, again and again. Is this institution which the state makes and unmakes, fashioning it after any shape which its caprices may fancy, an independent institution? Above all, can the claim to independence be tested by the facts concerning patronage, and stand? The church declares patronage to be not of Christ, but Antichrist; that it is not founded on the word of God, but opposed to it; and that it belongs to every congregation, unfettered by patronage, to elect its own minister; but what then? Its lord, the state, decrees that 'the just rights of the ancient patrons' be preserved, and 'binds and astricts' the church to 'admit whatever qualified person the patron shall present as minister.' And the obsequious church is not silent; she declares, in the face of her principles, that she does not wish these rights to be interfered with; she regards this binding and astricting act as her charter, and for well nigh three centuries she does as the state appoints, and passes her Veto Act in the year 1834, to spare patronage. She does more. Even in this claim of right, even in this memorial, passed at her eleventh hour, not one word escapes her in condemnation of patronage; much less does she

* Confession, chap. xxiii. 3.

demand from the state the removal of this antichristian yoke, which, by the will of the state alone, has been upon her neck for ages. Talk of spiritual independence after all this! No wonder that the stern law laughs her to scorn, remains inflexible to all her entreaties, her projects, her menaces; no wonder that scoffers hurl derision, and that her best friends blush and sigh.*

Will, then, the 'claim' and 'memorial' of the non-intrusion ministers be favourably answered by the government and the legislature? The proposals made hitherto for the removal of differences have failed. These proposals have been the three following:—First, the bill known by the name of 'Lord Aberdeen's Bill.' That measure purported to be, and was only a 'declaratory law;' that is, again setting forth the laws of the state on the subject of patronage, including that of Queen Anne, 1711, under which the church is placed, and in reality giving no additional powers to the church courts to those which they had prior to the passing of the veto. It was, therefore, rejected by the assembly, and withdrawn by his lordship, who, after having been hailed as a friend and deliverer, came under the unrestrained vituperation of those whom he professed to serve. Next came Sir George Sinclair's proposed clause, to amend the bill of Lord Aberdeen. That clause was prepared with infinite pains by the truly worthy baronet, and with a heart as warm to the church, and as much moved with alarm for her safety, as her best friends could have wished in an aristocratic mediator. It proposed a *liberum arbitrium* to the church courts,—that is, they must hear dissentients to the person presented by the patron, and if their reasons are valid, in the judgment of the presbytery, they should have the power of setting him aside; if, however, they seem invalid to the presbytery, but continue to be entertained by a considerable number, they may still reject the candidate, but may set the objections aside if they choose; and all this, without any interference on the part of the civil courts. The following are the

* Nothing is more remarkable, nothing more painful, connected with the 'claim,' than *its* silence on the subject of patronage. In the *acts* on which it founds, it is specifically shown that the *irrevocable* treaty of 'the union' betwixt Scotland and England, sanctioned 'the Act concerning patronages, whereby the right of presentation by patrons *was annulled and made void*' (Claim, p. 9) to the extent to which patronage was set aside, 1690, as formerly explained. Yet the church does not venture to claim this their right, confirmed by the state, and by this treaty of union itself. How is this? Alas! their consent to the Duke of Argyle's Bill sealed their lips—that Bill which, had it passed, would have given the fresh sanction, both of parliament, and *of the consenting church,* to this root of so much evil. Sad fruit of state connexion, of subjecting the church to the dictation of secular politics. *Hinc illæ lachrymæ!*

words of the clause as given by Sir George himself:—'In respect that the said objections and reasons (though not in themselves conclusive in the judgment of the presbytery) are entertained on Christian and conscientious grounds by such a proportion of the parishioners as (in the opinion of the presbytery) to preclude the prospect of his ministrations proving useful to that particular congregation;' then, according to the paragraph in Lord Aberdeen's Bill, in which the above words were to be inserted, the presbytery might, on recording the reasons, set aside the presentation.* Sir George obtained the consent of Lord Aberdeen, and even of the government, to this clause; and after much dealing, got also a 'reluctant consent' to it from the assembly's committee in Edinburgh; on this strange stipulation, however, that unless the bill, with this clause, were passed in the short autumnal session of 1841, they should not be bound by the agreement. Sir Robert Peel rejected this condition as absurd; the committee receded from their conditional agreement, on the lapse of the limited time; the measure was abandoned; and the disappointed baronet, with a grieved spirit, withdrew from negociations which he now regarded as hopeless.† Whatever may be thought of the non-intrusion brethren agreeing to an ecclesiastical settlement in autumn, which they deemed unsuitable for winter and for the subsequent years, we do not much wonder at their repugnance to the *liberum arbitrium* scheme. With the responsibility, it brought the whole odium of a doubtful or harsh decision upon the presbytery, or the other courts; in direct opposition to the principle of the veto, it bound them to hear and to judge of the reasons of dissentients, and, to some extent, even of their motives; if it empowered presbyteries to accept, it also empowered them at their option to disregard and overrule the dissents, and the reasons of the dissents of any body of parishioners; in every presbytery where the moderates preponderate, it threw the parishioners in helplessness, through the votes of that party, at the feet of the patrons; and in the event, a probable one, of the moderates returning to power by the exclusion of the *quoad sacra* people, and the favour of patrons for moderate candidates, it would bring the whole parishes of the land under that withering regime. In fact, this measure had only two recommendations, that it allowed the evangelicals to exonerate their consciences by what they believed to be a right vote, and that it protected the courts of the church from what they so vehemently dread, the interference of the law. The last measure, and one approved of, not as perfect, but as the basis of a safe settlement,

* Sir G. Sinclair's Correspondence, p. 9.
† Correspondence.—*Pass.*

was ‘ *The Duke of Argyll's Bill.*’ That bill is too long for insertion here; in general, it recognises the law of patronage as at present existing, but modifies its exercise, by adopting in some measure the principle of the veto. In place of ‘ the male heads,’ it vests the right of objecting in ‘ the male members of the congregation being of twenty-one years complete.’ It empowers the presbytery to judge of their objections, and even whether ‘ said dissent proceed from factious or malicious *motives;*’ it even allows ‘ the patron or presentee to establish before the presbytery or superior church judicatory, by evidence,’ the existence of these *motives;* and it authorizes the presbytery to ‘ take such means as they may judge suitable for removing misapprehensions from the minds of the people, and obviating their objections to the presentee,’ &c. The assembly had asserted in the veto the duty of rejecting any candidate opposed by a majority of male heads, no matter for what reasons. In May last they passed a vote condemning patronage altogether; yet, however incredible it may seem, *at that very meeting of the assembly,* they approved of this bill of the duke, with the fact staring them in the face, that this measure would not only supersede their veto, but imply their own consent to that very patronage which they had just condemned.

Extract of a Letter from the Rev. Mr. Candlish to the Duke of Argyll.

‘ Those of us who hold anti-patronage opinions on principles independent of the present struggle, see clearly that the passing of a sufficient measure of non-intrusion might, and necessarily would, supersede the agitation against patronage, and diminish the probability of its abolition. But we prefer the peace and security of the church to any particular views of our own; and any plan effectually securing the fundamental principles which the church is pledged to maintain, will meet with our hearty support. Accordingly, we fully concur in approving of each of the two measures sanctioned by the general assembly's committee. But I may refer your grace to a much fuller and more able exposition of our case in the recent publication of Mr. John Hamilton. In that pamphlet justice is done to the views of the anti-patronage party, and the real bearing of these views on the present conflict is most satisfactorily explained. In the mode of settling the question proposed by Mr. Hamilton we would all cordially concur.’

Extract from Letter, the Rev. Dr. Gordon to the Duke of Argyll.

‘ But I have no hesitation in saying that the church never has proposed, and does not now propose, the abolition of patronage as the only mode of settling the present most distressing question; and that

this assertion may not rest on my individual opinion, I beg to enclose for your grace's perusal, a document published by the authority of the general assembly's non-intrusion committee, containing draughts of two bills, in either of which they would acquiesce.'

Edinburgh, March 5, 1841.

'The committee having considered the documents referred to, unanimously resolve as follows:—

'They approve of the above letter, addressed by Dr. Gordon to the Duke of Argyll, and adopt that letter in all its parts, as containing a correct representation of the views and sentiments entertained by this committee and by the church of Scotland, which this committee represents, in reference to the matters which are treated in the said letter.

'2. That they renew an expression of their approbation of the above two draughts of bills, and record their conviction that an Act of Parliament passed in conformity with either of them would be acceptable to the church, and would prove the means of averting the fatal calamities which now so imminently threaten the church and country.'—*Extracted from the Minutes of the Committee by*

J. Hamilton, *Secretary.*'

We need not inform our readers that this bungling bill is in its grave, without the faintest hope of a resurrection.

What, then, must the non-intrusion brethren do? The law condemns them; the whigs would do nothing but leave them to the law; the tories tread in the steps of the whigs; the veto is not to be listened to; Lord Aberdeen is rather shrunk from as their betrayer, than trusted as their friend, and his bill is rejected by the church, and withdrawn by himself; even *liberum arbitrium* itself has been repudiated; and the poor Duke of Argyll is told that his measure 'can find favour only with an insignificant minority.'* Besides, the deposition of the Strathbogie brethren must be undone, and a consent to this, no matter how it may be got, or by what arcana of management the honour of the church may be provided for, must be plighted, ere any proposal whatever

* 'It is wholly impossible that the kind of veto which the leaders of the assembly contend for should be sanctioned by parliament. It would not obtain the consent of the House of Commons, and in the House of Lords it would find favour only with an insignificant minority. I hold the principle which it involves, to be inconsistent with good government, as well as with the real interests of the church. No threat of separation, no danger of schism, would, I am persuaded, induce the House of Lords to sanction it. . . . If it should end in the separation of a large body of pious and learned men from the established church, that, no doubt, will be a great evil to Scotland, and no inconsiderable one to England; but in my judgment it will be less injurious to the cause of religious truth than the affirmation of the principle for which they are contending.'—Letter of the Bishop of London. Sir G. Sinclair's Correspondence, p. 50. We take this opportunity of strongly recommending this volume, as, beyond any other, throwing light on the Scottish movements.

can be listened to by the government. Thus beset with perplexity, there is something truly pathetic in the lamentations, both of Sir George Sinclair and Dr. Chalmers. Says the former, 'How often, whilst residing at Edinburgh, have I risen from a sick-bed at three or four o'clock in the morning, for the purpose of committing to paper some expression calculated to soothe, or some argument intended to convince. How often during my valetudinarian rambles at this place have I endeavoured to cheer my drooping spirits, by indulging in the fond expectation, that the labours to which I was so unequal, but which no consideration ever induced me to intermit, would be blest in their result, as the means, under providence, of restoring the peace, and increasing the usefulness of an institution, which, from my earliest infancy, I had learned both to love and to revere. But these considerations are of little moment, in comparison with the alarm, as well as sorrow, which I experience on grounds connected with the public interest. I not only mourn over the failure of my own efforts, but am myself unable to discover how any future negotiator can succeed, or what plan it is possible to devise, which will not be deemed either excessive by the state, or inadequate by the general assembly.'* Says Dr. Chalmers, with equal pathos, 'the truth is, that in this harassing warfare I am able to hold out no longer. . . . . and to crown and consummate all, there have not only been the fatigues, but within these few weeks, the sore, bitter, crushing disappointment—*the blasting of all my fondest hopes for the good and peace of our church, in my correspondence with public and parliamentary men.*'† This was written in 1840. How must Dr. Chalmers now feel!

It is anything but our wish to subject either the 'claim' or the 'memorial' to the severity of criticism. While both documents possess that solemnity of character which belongs to a last effort, in a great crisis, and while we willingly accord to the assembly who prepared the 'claim,' and to the convocation who have sent forth the 'memorial,' a liberal share of that sympathy which we owe to brethren compassed with the infirmities of our common nature, and placed in the midst of difficulty and temptation, fidelity demands that we notice the defects and errors of these important documents. 1. In neither document is patronage itself condemned, nor is any claim, nor even petition, advanced for the removal of that confessedly antichristian yoke; but, on the contrary, a solemnly expressed willingness is contemporaneously expressed, to abide under that bondage as a term of peace. What means this pusillanimous shrinking from the occupation of sacred ground, to which their own principles and

* Correspondence, p. 179. † 'What ought the church to do?'—p. 61.

God's holy word invite them? Will the cry of non-intrusion and spiritual independence be regarded by men of piety, or men of sense, when uttered by those who, to maintain their status in the established church, submit to state-imposed patronage,—this perpetual badge, willingly worn, of state servility, this perpetual and confessed intrusion on Christian liberty? 2. The 'claim' embodies in its preamble, as ground on which it rests, some of the most intolerant of our Scottish statutes, such, for example, as the following—'establishing and ratifying the presbyterian *church government and discipline . . . to be the only government of Christ's church within this kingdom*,' . . . 'that the lords of her Majesty's town council, and all other magistrates, judges, and officers of justice, give all due assistance for making the sentences and censures of the church, and judicatories thereof, to be obeyed,' . . . 'to take effectual course for stopping and hindering those ministers who are, or hereafter shall be deposed by the judicatories of the present established church, from preaching or exercising any act of their ministerial function, which (the statute declares) they cannot do after they are deposed, without a high contempt of the authority of the church, and of the laws of the kingdom establishing the same.' Such are some of the statutes which the general assembly in 1842 wish to have enforced, and on which they rest their 'claim.' Can any friend to this free country sympathize with these statutes, before which, were they not obsolete, toleration would cease, and the liberties of every dissenting denomination in the land be under the feet of the dominant clergy? In charity, we believe many of these claimants are far better than their principles. The memorial is also rampant with high government views. 'Its entire secular sovereignty the state holds, *directly and exclusively from God.*' James the First, or Sacheverel, would scarcely have gone farther. 3. We humbly think also that the memorial might have specified *a time*, after which the memorialists would wait no longer in suspense and vain expectation. Their silence on this head may mislead both their friends and their opponents; especially when this want of definiteness as to the term of removal is coupled with so many assurances of an aversion to quit, with so express a condemnation of the voluntary principle, by which alone, if they do quit, they must learn to subsist; and, above all, by this ominous proffer, of which we leave the exposition to time, 'Were not the principles at issue vital and fundamental, there is no *compromise* to which they would not consent, *no sacrifice of feeling*, or even of *consistency*, to which they would not submit, if by any means they might avert a calamity (the 'disruption or overthrow' of the establishment), the very idea of which they have all along been most reluctant to entertain.'*

* Memorial, p. 23.

To this much, however, the great body of the late convocation seem pledged,—that unless a measure shall be obtained from the legislature possessing these two characters,—rendering it imperative on presbyteries to set aside every presentee against whom a clear majority of male members, or male heads of families being church members, shall dissent, and securing the ecclesiastical courts against all interference on the part of the courts of law, in all matters strictly spiritual, they must either abandon their places, or sacrifice before the churches of the world all claims to 'consistency' and character.

Most fervently do we pray that the non-intrusion brethren may not only resolve on the former sacrifice, but without delay, make it; nor can we restrain the fond hope that many of them will. Sadly as the terms have been hackneyed, *non-intrusion and spiritual independence* are noble watch-words for a church of Christ; and we cannot persuade ourselves that when these watch-words have once been taken up by any body of enlightened, honest, and pious men, and when they have passed into the household vocabulary of any portion of the faithful in Christ Jesus, they will lightly and vilely be cast away; or that they can fail to carry those who know and love the truths they denote, to the full length which understood duty to the Redeemer demands. But in order to this glorious potency, these expressions must convey definite principles, and these principles must be honoured by consistent practice. We take leave, therefore, to say, to these brethren,—if you are for non-intrusion, be for it, not vaguely, but definitely—not by halves, but in its entireness. Do not venture by your contrivances to modify rights which Christ has given to his true followers indiscriminately. Do not grant Christ's liberty to some of his subjects only, and arbitrarily deny it to others. Do nothing by partiality—give liberty to all. If you are for spiritual independence, let us know what you want, and let your deeds be in consonance with your words; keep out the secular patron as well as the secular judge; disregard the presentation as you disregard the interdict; cast this confessed leaven of antichrist out of the church of Jesus, and at once be independent and free. Go farther, we beseech you,—shew that you are as independent of the state for pay, as you ought to be for patronage. Do not regard as vile that sacred treasury which is replenished, however frugally, by the hearts of Christians warmed by the love, and enlarged by the grace of their Saviour; and no longer deride the principle, which, with its fruits, contented the first Christians, and sufficed for the support and the diffusion of the blessed gospel in the age of its brightest triumph and glory, which satisfied apostles, and their Lord himself.

While we speak thus, we are not insensible to the dangers,

civil, political, and religious, associated with a state-supported church, enjoying what she may choose to denominate spiritual independence. Men make systems; but systems also make men. Even were the offices of such a church to be filled with Christian men only, their system would pervert them, in spite of themselves. It cannot be denied that even Christian men are one set of beings in a false, and another in a fit position. Impart to ecclesiastics of any denomination state alliance, state pay, and spiritual independence, and what would follow? Precisely what has taken place before. As if religious liberty were unknown, they would claim over again the whole population as 'their people;' they would claim that churches should forthwith be built at the public charge 'for the entire population,' as if other churches either were not, or ought not to be; they would claim that the ministers of every church which they chose to build, and of every parish which it pleased them to 'constitute,' should be 'endowed' from the treasury to which all denominations contribute, and in spite of their remonstrances; they would, even the best of them, distrain the goods, and incarcerate the persons, of conscientious recusants of pay which was never earned; they would claim, perchance, that the laws of the land, hallowed by the sacred union of the kingdoms, should be practically respected, in which 'the whole confession of faith is established, ratified, and confirmed.' Presbyterian church government is declared the only government of Christ's church *in this kingdom*, without any alteration thereof, or derogation thereto, for ever,' and 'that all magistrates, judges, and officers of justice, shall give all due assistance for making the sentences and censures of the church be obeyed, *as accords*.' Should judges interfere with any of these sentences or censures as *illegal*, they would tell these judges they disregard their sentences; they are judges too—their courts 'are co-ordinate with the civil courts;' their 'kingdom' is co-ordinate with the British kingdom; that they have 'spiritual independence;' and that by statute, binding 'for ever, all judges and officers of justice, must give all due assistance for making the sentences and censures of the church be obeyed, *as accords*.' Can any good minister of Jesus Christ, not perverted by system, and with his eyes open to his Bible and his responsibility, covet a position like this, or degrade his office, and befool himself, by playing 'fantastic tricks' like these? But disconnect good men with such a bad system, loose their alliance with the state, place them on that unambitious ground on which the holy apostles placed the ministers and churches of Christ, and they are new men. The heights of clerical pride are forsaken for the humble level of Christian parity; extortion, compulsion, and violence, are renounced as alien to the kingdom of righteousness and peace; and they learn to provide things honest in

the sight of all men, loving without dissimulation, and doing to others as they would have others do to them. Spiritual independence of the very state that constitutes and upholds them! Every friend of liberty, of every religious party,—every unsophisticated mind in the empire, will support the civil judges, in frowning from them this arrogant claim. 'Claim of right' they call it; *claim of wrong* were its more appropriate name. As well might the soldiers present their 'memorial and claim of right' for military independence. Happily for the churches and for the country, the claim is as absurd as presumptuous; as impracticable in fact, as in theory it is proud; it is a claim for what never was, is not, and never shall be, world without end.

It is said popery is reviving, and we partly believe it. Is it unworthy of remark, especially by the friends of evangelical truth in the established churches, that the chief troubles of both these bodies at this day arise directly from that leaven which they brought with them from Rome? Puseyism pleads in its favour the rubrics, canons, catechisms, and liturgy of the English church; yet Puseyism is but popery under another name. And whence come the troubles of the northern establishment? from their *revenues*, their *patronage*, and their *state alliance*, all of which came, not from Christ, but Antichrist. To the evangelical ministers of the Scottish church we humbly venture to suggest, whether He, to whom it belongs to purge his own temple, is not now emphatically proclaiming to them, 'Take these things hence'? If they do this willingly, they shall have a reward; if not, the Redeemer will take his own way with them, as with others, to remove 'the wood, hay, and stubble,' which they mix with 'gold, silver, and precious stones,' and attempt to place, but shall prove unable to retain, on the one elect and precious foundation.

We cannot, however, repress our earnest wishes for the best interests of our non-intrusion brethren; and our fervent prayers, that it may please God to grant them a speedy and a scriptural deliverance. There are among them many—their Gordons, their Chalmerses, their Browns, their Hendersons, their Candlishes,—whose talents, accomplishments, and piety, would prove a blessing and an ornament to any church; and we trust the time approaches when they and the British dissenters may regard one another as dissenting brethren. Meanwhile, 'may our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and God, even our Father who hath loved us, and hath given us everlasting consolation, and good hope through grace, comfort their hearts, and establish them in every good word and work.'

P.S.—Since this article was written, the letter of Sir James Graham to the Moderator of the General Assembly, containing

the Answer of the Ministry to the Claim of Right, the Petition against Patronage, and a Memorial from the Commission of the General Assembly (apparently not the Memorial of the Convocation) has been published. The document is long, carefully prepared, and perfectly decisive. It is a stern denial of the demands of the non-intrusion brethren; it expressly refuses the redress of those grievances of which they affirm, 'if redress be not afforded, the inevitable result must be a disruption of the present established church of Scotland.'

In one point, Sir James evidently pushes the brethren too far. He connects their petition against patronage with their demand for non-intrusion and spiritual independence. Now, although the Assembly did petition against patronage, they expressly consented to act under it, should the government refuse their petition, by agreeing to the Duke of Argyll's bill, provided the other two demands were acceded to. In this we think, and have assigned reasons for thinking, the Assembly acted most inconsistently; but such is the fact. On the other two points, however, the letter of Sir James is decisive enough. The law, as it stands, must be honoured; the veto law and its results must be undone; the church must remain under the supervision and control of the law. Either, therefore, the brethren must secede from their principles, or from the church.

They will appeal, in the first instance, to parliament against the ministry and the judges. In adopting this only remaining measure, no one can blame them; but neither they nor any one else can anticipate any other result than a rejection of their appeal. God be with them! We trust they will obey the apostolical counsel: 'Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong.'

Art. II. *Vermischte Schriften grösstentheils Apologetischen Inhalts, &c. Miscellaneous Writings, for the most part of Apologetical Import.* By A. Tholuck, D.D. and D. Ph. Consistorial-Councillor, and Ordinary Professor of Theology in the Royal University of Halle-Wittenberg, Corresponding Member of the Royal Asiatic Society of London, of the Royal Norwegian Society of Science, and of the Society at the Hague pro Vindicanda Religione Christiana. 2 vols. 8vo. Hamburg. 1839.

EVERY person who is at all acquainted with the learned literature of modern Germany must be aware how large a proportion of it, as compared with that of other countries, is composed of collections of the occasional treatises of its most distinguished writers. It is impossible even to look over a foreign book catalogue without being struck with the number of 'Opuscula,' and 'Scripta varii

Argumenti,' and 'Dissertationes Miscellaneæ,' and 'Exercitationes,' and 'Disputationes,' and 'Commentationes,' and 'Vermischte Abhandlungen,' and 'Schriften,' and 'Beiträge,' the fruits of German industry, which crowd the pages of such productions. Professor Winer, in his very useful and accurate 'Handbook of Theological Literature,' enumerates, in that department alone, nearly two hundred such collections, chiefly from the pens of modern writers, of all sizes, excepting the smaller, in which books are printed, and some extending to many volumes. In the departments of law and medicine the supply is equally abundant; and in that of classical literature it passes reckoning. For the multiplication of the materials of which such collections are made up, the customs of the literary republic in Germany afford peculiar facilities. In addition to the periodicals which in teeming multitudes issue at almost every possible interval from the shop of almost every publisher, however humble, there are few occasions of public, or academical, or even private interest, within their own sphere, which the literati of Germany are not in the habit of celebrating by a dissertation or a diatribe. The death of one sovereign and the accession of another; the birth of an heir-apparent, his christening or his marriage; the gaining of a battle, or the discovery of an island; the founding of an hospital, the fitting out of an expedition, or the commemoration of an epoch—events which in this country are celebrated by the creation of peers and baronets, by universal dinners, or by copious effusions of academical hexameters—are in Germany consigned to immortality, by being made the occasion of grave and learned disquisitions on all sorts of *quæstiones vexatæ* in every department of literature. In the universities there are (one knows not how) many annual solemnities, each of which must be commemorated by some learned prolusion; the festivals of the church, the birthdays of eminent men—nay, the issuing of the semestrial programme of lectures, all being occasions for relieving the 'viri doctissimi et spectatissimi,' of their plethora of learned lore. And even when some favourite professor or distinguished scholar has been spared to reach his fiftieth year, his grateful pupils or admiring friends celebrate his jubilee by laying at his feet elaborate expositions of puzzling passages in the ancient writers, or curious speculations on the shadowy objects of German metaphysics. There is thus accumulated at the close of every year a mighty mass of opuscula; of which the major portion sinks gravitatingly into quick oblivion, leaving a few of the choicer sort life-gifted, to resist the envious assaults of change and time.

Such few their authors, or others for them, are careful to collect and re-issue when sufficiently numerous to form a volume. In this, we think, they do well. These occasional productions have

often in them more of the strength of their author's mind than his larger and more laboriously prepared works. The subjects of which they treat are generally such as have occupied much of his private studies, and so have become familiar to his mind; whilst the stimulus which occasions of public excitement, of professional emulation, or of private affection supply, tends to infuse into the composition a vigour and a liveliness which is apt to evaporate in the more tedious and less exciting process of elaborating a lengthened treatise. Collections of such treatises, accordingly, form a highly valuable part of every scholar's library. What student of the classics does not rejoice in the possession of Hermann's *Opuscula*? What theologian would willingly be without the *Scripta varii Argumenti* of the venerable Knapp, the *Dissertationes ad Historiam Ecclesiasticam pertinentes* of the learned Mosheim, or the *Sylloge Commentationum* of Pott and Ruperti.

In the volumes now before us we have a portion of the miscellaneous writings of one of the most valuable men at present in Germany. Of Dr. Tholuck—of his profound and varied learning, his unwearied diligence, his unaffected piety, his blameless deportment, and his invaluable services to the cause of evangelical truth, especially in his own country—our readers already know too much to render it necessary for us to say anything. Among the numerous parties into which the theologians of Germany are divided, the place occupied by Dr. Tholuck is in the very foremost rank of the defenders of a pure and scriptural theology, in opposition to the speculative theology of those who would construct a system by engrafting on the statements of revelation the dogmas of Kant or Hegel. In maintaining his ground against these, as well as against the Rationalists whom these have in a great measure superseded, he has displayed a combination of mental resources and Christian virtues which has made even his enemies yield him their homage. In this respect he has an advantage over his friends and co-workers, Neander and Hengstenberg, who, with equal talents and learning, want, the former his uncompromising consistency, and the latter his winning suavity. Among the means by which Dr. Tholuck has laboured to support and propagate evangelical sentiments, the editing of a religious periodical has formed neither the least laborious nor the least important. Of this work, which is open to articles on all departments of Christian theology, the learned editor has from the first been one of the principal supporters by his contributions. These consist, for the most part, of reviews of important works in theology or biblical science, and articles on topics of moment to the theologian arising out of passing events, interspersed occasionally with treatises of greater length and more permanent interest. Of the latter he has collected the

most valuable among his own contributions in the volumes before us, and having first subjected them to revision, and in some cases to alteration, has republished them, with the addition of one or two which have not before appeared.

We shall best consult the advantage of our readers by first giving them the titles of the different articles (thirteen in number) of which these volumes are composed, and then entering with greater minuteness upon the analysis of one or two of the more interesting and important. Of the first volume the contents are as follows:—I. The Miracles of Muhammed, and the Character of this Religionist. II. On the Miracles of the Catholic Church, and especially on the relation of them and the Scripture Miracles to the Phenomena of Magnetism and Somnambulism. III. On Apologetic and its Literature. IV. On the Hypothesis of the Egyptian, Phœnician, or Indian Origin of the Name Jehovah. V. The History of Balaam. VI. Count Zinzendorf.

The second volume has articles under the following titles:—I. Sketch of the revolution which has taken place in the department of theology in Germany since 1750. II. What is the result of scientific research in regard to the antediluvian world? Together with a literary reference to the most valuable works on this subject. III. Remarks on the personal history, the character, and the language of the Apostle Paul, as introductory to the study of his Epistles. IV. The services of Calvin as an interpreter of the holy Scriptures. V. Notices of Goethe, Keppler, Jacobi, and of De Wette's Compendious Exegetical Manual. VI. On the nature of the sin against the Holy Ghost. VII. Appendix to article II. in the first volume.

In all these treatises, some of which are of considerable length, the reader will find valuable materials for study, interspersed with much fresh and beautiful remark. They are very far, however, from possessing equal interest or importance. The first two in Vol. I., appear for the first time in this collection, and in our opinion, might without much injury either to the cause of truth, or the reputation of the author, have been entirely omitted. They are far from being fully satisfactory in the conclusions to which the author comes on the topics he discusses in them, and the latter contains some speculations which appear to us visionary, and of very questionable import in a Scriptural point of view. It is true that the esteemed author repudiates the opinion that the miracles of our Lord and his Apostles had any affinity to the achievements of animal magnetism, or the phenomena of somnambulism; but the very deference which he pays, in elaborately refuting it, to this wild and absurd hypothesis of the infidel, seems to us calculated to prove injurious to the claims of Scripture in the mind of the general public, whilst

the pains taken by Dr. Tholuck to explain and support the doctrines of animal magnetism and somnambulism, will not fail with many to shake their confidence in his good sense and sound judgment. To us it is unspeakably vexatious to see such men as he and Olshausen, so completely led away by what we cannot but despise as the mere hallucinations of a dreamy and distempered philosophy.

The third article in the first volume possesses very considerable interest, and is deserving of lengthened notice. After defining 'Apologetic,' to be 'the scientific exhibition of the reasons of the divinity of the Christian religion,' the author proceeds to call in question the value, as an independent proof of the truth of Christianity, of what are called the external evidences. These he contends can only establish the *fides historica*, and are insufficient for the *fides viva*. They may serve to silence or confound the infidel, but will not of themselves *convince* him that Christianity is true. Before this can be done, he must have received the *doctrines* of Christianity as suitable to his case. Without this, the historical facts on which our religion is based, will either awaken in his mind no interest, or be viewed by him under all the darkening influence of hostile prejudice. From this Dr. Tholuck argues that in order to prove the truth of Christianity, we must unfold and explain its doctrines, exhibit its precepts, and describe its history. 'Conviction,' he says, 'is the result of a properly constructed system of dogmatical and ethical theology, of correct church-history, and pastoral science, and that not in the way of making the proof of Christianity a sort of appendix to these subjects, but that these subjects themselves should be so treated as that the necessity and reasonableness of their scientific construction should evince the truth of Christianity, much in the same way as, in point of fact, its truth and divinity are shown when an individual finds that by becoming a sounder Christian, he at the same time becomes a more perfect man; or when a state, in proportion as it is christianized, exhibits in fuller measure the perfection of a state. From this it follows,' continues the author, 'that there can be no scientific proof of the truth of Christianity, except what would be furnished in the completion (vollendung) of the theological sciences; a system of faith and morals, a church history, and a pastoral theology, corresponding to their ideal, would be the most adapted to prove the truth of Christianity.'—p. 155.

Though our design in this article is rather to supply our readers with a synopsis of the contents of the volumes before us, than to submit the author's peculiar sentiments to criticism, we cannot pass on without remarking that in the views advanced in the above extract, the learned writer appears to us to con-

found two things which are very different from each other, viz.: the receiving of Christianity as divine, and the receiving of the truths of Christianity as truths. These are by no means identical. It is one thing to admit that the Bible contains a religion of divine authority; it is quite another thing, on the ground of that authority, to yield a hearty credence to the statements contained in the Bible. We may without difficulty suppose the former of these positions accepted, when the latter is not thought of, or even when there is a strong disposition in the mind to reject it; just as we may suppose the assertion that the material universe is the creation of God to be admitted, when there is great ignorance of the many recondite phenomena of that universe, or great indifference regarding them. Under these circumstances, it is not impossible to substantiate the position, that Christianity is divine, without first proving that certain truths compose the system of Christianity, and are deserving of our regard. It is true, that aversion from the truths of the Bible will tend in no small degree to impede our perception of the force of the evidence adduced in its support, in the same way as our dislike of any truth stands in the way of our clearly perceiving its claims upon our credence. But when it is affirmed that the way to remove this aversion, is to explain and illustrate the hated truths, the regimen appears to us much more likely to increase than to remove the disorder. We can conceive of no way in which the infidel can be effectually met, but on the ground of the external evidences—a ground which is common to him and to his opponents, and for the occupation of which no endowments beyond such as are common to all men of intelligence are required. If the effect of an argument, based on this ground, be merely to silence, not to convince the infidel, this much, at least, is gained in regard to him,—that being silenced, he is in much more favourable circumstances for being plied with the truths of Christianity, than when he could turn all entreaty and argument aside by the boastful assertion, that Christianity is an imposture. To rebut such an assertion, to drive him from such a position, is surely to secure for the advocates of the Bible a vantage ground, which it would be alike foolish and sinful in them to despise.

From these general observations on the science of Apologetic, Dr. Tholuck proceeds to review the works of the principal Christian Apologists of recent times, beginning with Grotius, whose work, entitled *De veritate Religionis Christianæ*, he regards as the 'model, and occasion of innumerable other apologetical writings by English, French, and German scholars.' Here the learned author is upon ground where his prodigious knowledge of books, and his correct taste for literature, enable

him to furnish much useful material to the reader. We shall content ourselves with condensing his general estimate of the different works passed under review by him.

GROTIUS.—For the history of this little book the following motto may serve:—'*Carcer eruditorum museum.*' Composed in the prison of the Castle of Lövestein; it made its appearance in the first instance, in Dutch verse, with the title, 'Bewyss van de waren godsdienst, in veersen gestellt door Hugo de Groot, (Proof of the True Religion set forth in Verses by H. de Groot.) It was afterwards recomposed in Latin, and appeared at Paris in 1627. In 1640, it was anew revised by the author, and issued in the form in which it now exists, with Notes. Its popularity was unbounded. It was speedily translated into most of the languages of modern Europe. The learned Pococke translated it into Arabic. The Romanist missionaries adopted it as of service to them, and had it translated into Persian. Even the languages of China and Malabar were employed to give it more extensive circulation among the myriads of the east.

Of this so very famous work, the great charm lies in the perspicuity and conclusiveness of its reasonings; though it must be confessed, that considering the extent of the subject discussed, it is deficient in comprehensiveness. It is marked throughout with traces of the wonted learnedness of the author; as, for instance, in the accurate and highly interesting references to the affinity between the legends and histories of the Greeks and other nations, and the records of the Hebrews, I. i. § 15, 16; iii. § 16. A glance at its contents will satisfy every one of what its author's commentary on Paul's Epistles, compared with those of the Reformers, also amply attests, that his insight into Christian doctrine was not so profound as could have been desired. He occupies rather the ground of Erasmus—that of an all too outward supernaturalism, than that of a living relish for the great truths of the gospel—a circumstance, by the way, which explains how he came, the longer he lived, ever the more to incline towards Romanism; so that towards the close of his life, little lay between him and a transition into the bosom of the Romish church. This want of a sounder and deeper perception of the substance of the Gospel may have been the reason why he takes less account of the doctrines of Christianity in his Apology, than his predecessors, Morney and Vives, who, though certainly without that clearness and good order which mark the work of Grotius, introduce with much effect into their works on the truth of the Christian religion references to the Fall and to Redemption, to Angels and Devils, &c. At the same time, the work of Grotius will always be worth reading, were it for nothing else than the many interesting notes, which, out of the

wealth of his prodigious reading, he has with admirable accuracy thrown together, and which Le Clerc has revised, and still augmented. No one, as already remarked, has adduced so many parallels to the Mosaic History from other sources; such as the general diffusion through all the ancient nations of the practice of dividing their time into portions of seven days, of traditions concerning the Flood and Noah's Dove, the superior height of men in the early age of the world, &c. It is also peculiar to him, that in support of the original unity of the human race, he has adduced not only the gradual spreading and establishing of peoples, but also the community of institutions and opinions in respect to such things as sacrifices, incest, &c., which is to be traced, he thinks, 'non tam naturæ instinctus aut evidenti rationis collectioni, quam perpetuæ et vix paucis in locis per malitiam aut calamitatem interruptæ traditioni.'

The English Apologists in general of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries.—Since the seventeenth century, no country has been so rich in defences of Christianity as England; but as a poor defence of truth is worse than none, one cannot greatly rejoice over this multitude of apologies for our faith. The majority of the English apologists are like the man who screamed out, 'robbery and murder,' whilst he was himself casting his property out at the window. In defending the shell they cast away the kernel; feeling themselves wanting in proper weapons for conflict, they have recourse to compromise and barter. Of these lukewarm apologists, the *choragus* is Locke, who in his *Reasonableness of Christianity*, evinces what Leibnitz so truly said of him: 'inclinavit ad Socinianos (quemadmodum et amicus ejus Clericus,) quorum *paupertina* semper fuit de Deo et mente philosophia.'* Pfaff is not the only one who ranks this defender of Christianity with Shaftesbury, Toland, and others of its *enemies*.† The great applause with which his book was received, is due chiefly to the circumstance that men were pleased that so famous a philosopher should do the humble Gospel the honour to believe its histories, and take any trouble about it!

Locke's work aims at bringing the Christian religion entirely to a level with the so-called healthy human understanding, so that this should believe nothing that is higher than itself. Of all Christianity, the sole remaining peculiar doctrine, according to Locke, is, that 'Jesus is the Messiah,' as his miracles prove. From the appearance of this Messiah, the advantages accruing to man, are the following:—1. Men having previously only an imperfect, and at any rate, not universal knowledge of God and moral principles, Jesus furnished them with the fullest repre-

* Ep. ad Bierlingium. Epp. Leibnitz, ed. Kortholt, IV. p. 25.
† Pfaffii Hist. Theol. II. 291.

sentations of Deity, and the best instruction in duty. 2. For a worship overloaded with ceremonies, Jesus substituted prayer in spirit and truth. 3. Virtue had found little favour from men, because her votaries were often unfortunate in this life; Jesus removed this objection by teaching men that virtue would be rewarded in futurity. 4. Jesus has promised in our conflict with scoffers, to sustain us by his Spirit, though there is no way of ascertaining how this will be done. A Christianity so attenuated as this, even the deist might swallow without nausea!

The same superficiality of Christian knowledge which appears in the work of Locke may be traced, in a certain degree, in all the English apologists of that time. In none of them do we find the pith and marrow of the age of the Reformation. The only exception we can make is that of Philip Skelton, who brings forward, in his work entitled, *Ophiomaches, or Deism revealed*, the peculiar doctrines of the Gospel; and, in the preface, complains of the neglect of these by the apologists of his own country. At the same time, great value is deservedly attached to such of these works as argued against the objections of the infidel on particular subjects: such as Lardner's immortal work on the 'Credibility of the Gospel History,' with his 'Collection of Ancient Jewish and Heathen Testimonies to the Truth of the Christian Religion;' Warburton's 'Divine Legation of Moses,' Campbell's admirable Refutation of Hume's attack on the Miracles, &c.

Of the most celebrated of the works thus generally characterized, three are selected by Dr. Tholuck for more minute examination. These are those of Addison, of Paley, and of Butler. English readers will doubtless be surprised to see the place thus assigned to the work of Addison. Why Dr. Tholuck should have selected it at all we are at a loss to conceive; for, after giving a very full analysis of its contents, he concludes by saying that 'it is rather to be regarded as an elegant and creditable monument to the author himself, than as a thorough and sufficient defence of Christianity.'

Of Paley's work he says, after a very full analysis of its contents:—

'It appears from this survey that the author rests the evidence of Christianity in an extravagant degree on the miracles; and that without, in the first instance, having made it quite certain that the bold conduct of the apostles can be accounted for in no other way than by the supposition of miracles during the life of Christ.'

This remark, we must observe, in passing, shews that Dr. Tholuck has not clearly apprehended Paley's arguments. Paley does not propose to account for the steadfast adherence of the apostles to their testimonies, on the ground that they had wit-

nessed miracles performed by our Lord, but on the ground simply that what they thus persisted in attesting must actually have occurred. This granted, Paley proceeds, as to a *new* step in his argument, to the remark that the facts they attested were miraculous.

'Whilst, however, we must rank him among those apologists who are deficient in true and profound insight into the essence of Christianity, nobody can deny the great acuteness and dexterity which in this, as in all his other works, he displays.'—p. 191.

The notice of Butler is introduced with the following characteristic sentence:—

'If there be but one common Lord for the kingdom of nature and that of grace, it becomes a sacred duty for the proficient in natural science and the Biblical scholar to clasp hands before his throne, and together seize their harps to raise to him a psalm of praise.'

The estimate formed by our author of Butler seems to us much more just than that which he has given of Paley. Whilst commending the Bishop, however, for the attention he has paid in his work to the fundamental truths of Christianity, he complains that the analogy which he traces is that not so much of the *kingdom* of nature as of the *course* of nature; of the 'common-place jejune (!) reflexi ons on things which we see passing around us every day,' to which this has led; of 'the great breadth of the representation (dartsellung),' which makes the reading of the book, especially in the German version, very tedious; and of 'the too mechanical anthropomorphic mode which the author has adopted in treating of divine things.' Some parts of this criticism, we must say, we do not exactly understand, whilst other parts fill us with unbounded amazement.

From Butler Dr. Tholuck passes on to Dr. Chalmers, of whose *Astronomical Discourses* he gives a very full analysis, accompanied with translations of the more impressive passages. He concludes his notice of the work thus:—

'The copious flow of language, the brilliant fancy, the precise understanding, and the well-regulated heart of this distinguished orator, himself once hovering on the confines of unbelief, cannot fail to impress our readers with respect for the man, and at the same time excite the wish that many such pious and gifted speakers were found in the pulpits of Germany. I hope, also, that the specimens I have given may induce our young men to study a language which contains such valuable treasures for the theologian.'—pp. 223, 224.

French Apologists.—From among these Dr. Tholuck selects Pascal, Huet, and Bonnet, for especial examination, passing over more rapidly the claims of the later writers of that nation who have treated of the Christian evidences. On Pascal he bestows

high, but not exaggerated, praise. After stating the general argument which it was the design of that great thinker to have unfolded in support of the Christian faith, he proceeds to communicate to his readers some of the more valuable of those immortal 'Thoughts' which are the only fragments remaining to us of what their author had prepared for his great work. In the works of Huet he commends especially the copiousness of classical learning which they display, and which the author turns to good account for his argument, as well as the grace of his style and precision of his thoughts; but he complains of the want of critical and logical discernment apparent in many of the proofs which he adduces. Of Bonnet's contributions to the science of Apologetic, the estimate formed by our author is not very high, though he accords him the praise of great acuteness of observation and unction (salbung) of expression.

German Apologists.—Among these, Dr. Tholuck selects for particular notice Leibnitz, Haller, and Euler. Of the first of these he writes completely *con amore*, and with all a German's natural enthusiasm for that wonderful impersonation of the very essence and spirit of German philosophy. After defending Leibnitz from the charge that his writings have a tendency to infidelity, as well as from the antagonist charge that he inclined to popery, he proceeds to give a very full review of his services in defence of Christianity; and a few extracts from this part of the work will not, we believe, prove unacceptable to our readers.

'Leibnitz cannot be regarded as an historical apologist for Christianity, excepting in respect of a few remarks scattered through his letters. This is the more to be regretted, from the circumstance that seldom have the same philosophic acuteness and the same historical knowledge been found combined in any individual believer. His apologetic was dogmatical. It was the sceptical giant Bayle who brought him on the arena. Bayle had roused from slumber the old foe of Christianity, Manichæism, with renovated vigour; and it belonged to no inferior spirit to that of Leibnitz to exorcise him. This he did in his 'Theodicée,' of which the following synopsis contains the leading thoughts:—

'The Deity, the all-perfect Being, is power, wisdom, and goodness. The highest wisdom, combined with an equally infinite goodness, must always choose the *best;* for as a less evil is a sort of good, so also a less good is a sort of evil, so far as it hinders a greater good. As in mathematics, where there is no maximum or minimum, in general no degrees, all is accomplished alike, or, when this cannot be, nothing is accomplished at all; so of the Divine Wisdom, we may say, that either it will construct the best world or that it will construct none.

'But if there be a world which is the best, the wickedness and evil in it cannot prevent the highest end; an inference which, it is granted,

we could not assume *à priori*, but which may be concluded *à posteriori*, from the fact that we find these in the actually existing world. The bad and the evil cannot be referred to God himself; they proceed rather from the ideal nature of the creature, which of necessity (since, by the very nature of a creature, it cannot equal the Creator in perfection,) always is limited, and consequently imperfect. Whatever the bad has in itself of positive being, is, indeed, from God, inasmuch as he is the source of all being and of all power; but the formal constitution (*beschaffenheit*) of the bad, the negative, does not proceed from God. It is with this as with a stream, which is the intended cause of the ship's progress, but not of its retardation; though of this, also, it may be the occasion. The bad, or moral evil, moreover, is the main ground of physical evil, a real Manichæan principle in the universe—for a Caligula causes more evil than an earthquake. God, however, permits both moral and physical evil to exist. The former is permitted as the *conditio sine qua non*, by means of a *necessitas hypothetica*, inasmuch as it is only on this presumption that the *best* can exist. The latter is permitted because it serves as a punishment to deter from greater evil; or because, like the rotting of the seed, a deliverance all the greater is thereby brought to the suffering transgressor; or, finally, because it inflicts on the hardened sinner the punishment he has merited. If any should hint that the evil in the world has always exceeded the good, and that consequently there is in mankind more of wickedness than of goodness, and, by reason of this, a greater number who shall be finally lost than shall be saved, it may be replied that, in this world, we must take into account not man alone, but also the animal and vegetable creation; and that, as respects eternity, we must have regard, not only to the limited number of men who shall be found in the blessed kingdom of Christ, but also to the innumerable host of holy angels. In this way the entire universe may be seen, in virtue of the *harmonia præstabilita*, to develop itself, according to the plan originally devised by God as the wisest, in the form of an articulate whole corresponding to its design; which design is to be sought, not simply in the beatification of rational beings, though this be the main end, but in the revelation of God generally,—that is, in the kingdom of nature. For though the kingdom of nature exists for the service of the kingdom of grace,—i. e., to serve the purposes of the moral world, this is nevertheless not its sole design, as it exists also on its own account.'—(*Theodicée*, P. ii. § 118.)—pp. 324—326.

'The 'Theodicée' was preceded by a tract entitled *De la Conformité de la Foi avec la Raison*, which may be viewed as a distinct apologetical work. In this Leibnitz unfolds the principles on which his polemics against the Socinians and the English deists are based. 'There are,' says he, 'both *eternal* truths and *positive* truths. The former are those, the denial of which involves a contradiction, and on which, consequently, a logical, a metaphysical, or a mathematical necessity rests; the latter are such as are founded on the laws of nature, and which are discovered by us either *à posteriori* by experience, or *à priori* by reason, which teaches us their adaptation to some end.

Eternal truths involve a *necessitas geometrica*, whilst those which are positive possess a *necessitas physica*, which, again, rests on a *necessitas moralis*—i.e., on the wisdom of the Divine determination. Under the head of contradictions of positive truths may be ranked *miracles*, which, however, are not on that account to be viewed as contrary to reason, for is it not perfectly in accordance with reason to suppose that the Divine Wisdom may, for the accomplishment of certain purposes in the kingdom of grace, introduce new laws at certain periods into the domain of nature? In no revelation from God, however, can we find that which contradicts an eternal truth; for in such a case there would be a logical absurdity, and such can neither be understood nor believed. Of the truth of a revelation we satisfy ourselves in exactly the same way as we do in regard to all other matters belonging to the department of experience; only that in this case an inward Divine power co-operates with our own minds. Satisfied that the revelation is divine, we must feel persuaded that in it no logical or metaphysical contradictions can be found, and under this persuasion we shall infer that wherever such a contradiction *seems* to be, it can be only in appearance, and is to be traced to our not thoroughly comprehending the subject. Logic teaches us that if $a = b$ and $b = c$, then $a = c$. If we Christians, then, say that the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Spirit is God, and maintain that with a threefold distinction of persons there is yet but one God, it may appear as if there were a contradiction in what we say; but it is only in appearance, and even this is removed when we consider that in the one case we speak of the Divine *Substance*, and in the other of Divine *Persons*. *Non sunt tres Dei, sed ter est Deus.* It is true that though in this way the contradiction may be removed from this as from all Christian verities, the *how* still remains hid from us; but in what a multitude of instances is this the case with the mysteries of nature? By the testimony of our senses we are persuaded of the existence of smells and tastes without comprehending their nature; and so in like manner, on the testimony of faith we embrace the mysteries of Christianity. The evidence of the witnesses in this case is such as to supply the lack of evidence arising from the subjects. We must always, too, distinguish between *illustrating* and *comprehending*. The former is, within certain limits, possible even in the case of a mystery; the latter is not. As the new governor whom his sovereign has sent to rule a province is bound to satisfy the senate of his commission before he can assume his power, so is it required of revelation to substantiate its claims at the bar of reason, and this done, it becomes forthwith the duty of reason reverently to obey.''—pp. 330—332.

The fourth treatise in vol. i. is one of great value, and on a subject of very considerable importance in the controversy with the Neologians. With copious and ready learning, as well as admirable acuteness, the author exposes the miserable attempts of the Rationalists to derive the word 'Jehovah' from some other source than the Hebrew. Anxious to shew that the Jehovah of

the Old Testament was merely the national deity of the Jewish mythology, of whom the people of Israel had formed their superstitious notions in the same way as the nations around them had of their tutelar idols, Voltaire, with his usual flippant ignorance, and the German Neologians, with their misapplied learning, have laboured to trace it to an Egyptian or a Phœnician source. The authorities on which this derivation is rested are shewn by Dr. Tholuck to be singularly futile; and, indeed, the more recent Neologians appear to be ashamed of them, at least one may judge so from their no longer adducing them. A more favourite theory at present appears to be that of De Wette, who, *assuming* the affinity of the names *Jehovah* and *Jovis*, says, 'both names have an older and deeper source [than from the Hebrew], and probably Jehovah was as much a proper name as Jupiter.' To this Dr. Tholuck replies by first admitting that, judging merely from *similarity of sound*, a very fair case might be made out in favour of the affinity of these two words. The old form of *Jovis* was *Djovis*, equivalent to, Lat. *Deus*; Æol. Δεύς; Gr. Ζεύς; Armen. *Thew*: Pers. *Dew*; Hind. *Dewa*. Nay, we may go still deeper for the root of these words; for *djo* or *diw* means, in Sanscrit, *heaven* (Bopp says, also *day*,) with which we may compare the Lat. *divum*, *sub dio*, and Gr. διοσημεῖα; *dies-piter*, in Sansc. *diwaspati*, day-lord. So also, in Esthonian, *Jummal* means both *God* and *heaven*; and in Chinese, *thian* is heaven, and *Thi* is God. It is no objection, it may be said, to the derivation of Jehovah from Djovis that the *D* is thrown off from the beginning, for this often happens; compare Sansc. *dvi*, two, and *vinsati* twenty, Lat. *duo* and *viginti*, &c. All this, Dr. Tholuck admits as having a fair look; but he proceeds to remind his readers that similarity of sound is not always a true index of community of origin in words. This he illustrates by a well-chosen example, and then proceeds thus:—

'As respects the comparison of *Jehovah*, or *Jahave*, or *Jahvo* (for we shall not attempt here to determine the proper vocalization of the word) with *Jovis*, or, to take the original root, with the Sanscrit *Dewa*, it is not unimportant, in the first place, to consider how it happens that the *D* with which the older form commences, should come to be retained in more recent dialects, like the Greek and Latin, whilst it is thrown away in the Hebrew. Further, if the Hebrew word have sprung from *Djo*, whence the ה? Does not this letter clearly point to היה as the root? It would be a different case, were it impossible to find an etymological source for the word in the Hebrew. But it is not so; this can be done most perfectly. In the first place, the הוה with ו from the verb היה, actually occurs in the imperative in poetry which cherishes archaisms. Compare Job. xxxvii. 6; Gen., xxvii. 29; Isaiah xvi. 4. In the next place, the word may be written as a future יְהוֶה,

and thus corresponds to the Ἰαβέ, which must have been the Samaritan pronunciation of Jehovah. The meaning thus afforded is quite suitable to the passage, Exodus, iii. 14. The future has often the sense of *continuance;* 'for what continues is unfulfilled, is ever again becoming, and that indefinitely.' (Ewald, smaller Grammar, § 264.) Hence יעקב means not one who has once been overreached, but the overreacher. In like manner the name יהוה means the being who ever remains like himself, the Unchangeable; which meaning the passages, Mal. iii. 6; Hos. xii. 6; Rev. i. 4, 8, likewise favour.'—pp. 400—401.

To this etymology of the word, by which the Eternal was pleased to reveal himself to his people, we see no solid objection. It is the derivation in favour of which almost all the heroes of Hebrew literature, previous to the middle of the last century, have given their suffrages.* We are happy to learn, also, from Dr. Tholuck, that it has been adopted by Gesenius, perhaps the greatest name among the more recent cultivators of the sacred tongue, and is advocated in his great work, now in course of publication, his 'Thesaurus Linguæ Hebraicæ,' though in his earlier writings he had professed a leaning towards the hypothesis of an Egyptian origin.

We now leave the first volume of the work before us and proceed to the second, where, at the threshold, a very important treatise awaits us, on 'The Revolution which has transpired in the Department of Theology, in Germany, since the Year 1750.' Of this revolution, the author remarks, that 'in its way it is without a parallel. To the ancient religions of Greece and Rome,' he continues, 'a time came when they lost their authority over the minds, especially of the more cultivated members of society, but even there the priesthood watched over their sacred things. In France, also, and not less in Protestant England, infidelity has had its triumphs among the higher classes; but there, too, the clergy have been the parties who, whether from pure or sinister motives, have appeared as its opponents. In Germany, on the contrary, since the middle of the last century, a disbelief of the fundamental truths of Christianity has grown up, of which the clerical order have been the chief promoters, though many of them were not ignorant that by this the basis of the ecclesiastical system was also endangered.' The author ascribes this peculiar result in Germany, partly to the greater poverty of the German church,

* Hadrian Reland published, in 1707, at Utrecht, a valuable collection of tracts on the word Jehovah, chiefly bearing on the proper pronunciation of it, but containing much valuable information on other points, under the title, '*Decas Exercitationum de vera Pronuntiatione Nominis Jehovah.*' The writers are Drusius, Amama, Capellus, Buxtorf, Alting, N. Fuller, Gataker, and Leusden.

but principally to that peculiarity of the German mind, which displays itself 'in a greater dread of being scientifically inconsequent, than of sacrificing, in the department of practice, the most influential, and, in the minds of the people, the most hallowed institutions.' After stating that he does not regard the change which took place among the German clergy, during the period specified, as altogether to be traced to scepticism, but as partly, also, owing to a genuine desire for a science more adapted to the essence of Christianity than had before existed, he announces that 'his design in this sketch is to point out in what way, under what favouring circumstances, and by what steps, the modern views have been unfolded.'—p. 1, 2.

He commences with a view of 'the state of theology at the beginning of the second half of the eighteenth century.' This he describes as a period of quiet among the controversialists in the Lutheran church, degenerating gradually into a state of indifference and apathy among theologians generally. The pietism of Spener and Francke was beginning to lose its hold over the minds of the rising generation of students. A new race had appeared which knew not these men, and the morose asceticism with which, in some instances, attachment to their doctrines was associated, helped to make them more unpopular. But nothing injured the cause of orthodoxy in the Lutheran church so much as the neglect into which learned studies had fallen among its pastors.

'The controversialists of the seventeenth century had trained themselves deftly in science. A Flacius, a Calovius, a Quenstedt, demand, even in the present day, respect for their knowledge. But after the ascendancy of the Spenerian school, things were altered in this respect. When men could no longer use their lore in doctorial theses and prelections against Papists, Socinians, the Reformed, and the Pietists, it seemed as if they could no longer see of what good it was. The knowledge of Hebrew and Greek was chiefly prized by the Pietist theologians from the assistance it afforded in the edifying and impressive explanation of Scripture. Those pastors who had been educated in the school at Halle were, indeed, for the most part, good Hebraists, having enjoyed the instructions of an able and active teacher, John Henry Michaelis, and after him of his nephew, Ch. Benedict Michaelis, who rendered such good service by his edition of the Hebrew Bible and his Collation of the Erfurt Codices. But notwithstanding this, the number of learned men in the universities of Leipsic, Wittenberg, Halle, Koenigsberg, and Frankfurt, about the year 1750, was lamentably small. . . . Now infidelity entered Germany, not as in France with the weapons of wit and mockery alone, but fortified with learned investigations. It is not to be wondered at then, that, when those whose business it was to oppose it were so little prepared to meet it on this ground, its victories should have been

rapid ; the more especially that (as already remarked) the pernicious sceptical principle was, in many cases, associated with a sound impulse towards clearer and deeper conceptions of theological science.'—pp. 9, 10.

A fourfold influence from without conspired to expedite the revolution that was thus germinating within the Lutheran church. In the *first* place there was the influence of the Wolfian philosophy. Wolf was Professor of Mathematics in Halle, in 1706; was expelled his office, and banished from the Prussian dominions by Frederick-William I., for the levity of some of his speculations; became thus an object of interest and importance to the reading and thinking world; continued his speculations, and pushed them still further than he had at first attempted; gained followers in all quarters; and at length, in 1740, was restored to his Professorship amidst a tumult of applause, which, but for the jealousy and dislike of some of his colleagues, would have been universal. Some of the theological and juridical professors paid him the compliment of re-constructing their prelections on the principles of his philosophy, and a society was formed at Weissenfels, near Halle, under the name of Alethophiles, for the purpose of cultivating and propagating his doctrines. In the department of theology his greatest disciple was Sigmund James Baumgarten, Professor at Halle, from 1734. 'It is incredible with what enthusiasm this teacher of the theology of his time was listened to. About four hundred theologians, and even jurists and physicians, sat at the feet of the venerated man, and took down every, even the minutest word that fell from his lips. Scarcely another class could meet when Baumgarten was holding his! And now let any one compare his printed prelections as they have come down to us; what dead schematism! what dry table-making! and the whole dictated in the most long-winded style!'—p. 12.

It was not so much from the *principles* of Wolf's philosophy, which are much the same as those of Leibnitz, that the influence injurious to Christianity emanated, as 'from the spirit, or rather the non-spirit of his system, which again displayed itself in his method. The latter was the formal-logical. From the two logical principles of a *ratio sufficiens*, and a *principium contradictionis*, Wolf had endeavoured, by patient and laborious efforts after clearness, and following in every case the same scheme, to erect geometrically the edifice of every science. Prefixing definitions, which in place of excluding empirical representations, only reproduced these in the form of thoughts, he built on them conclusions, joined one formal conclusion to another, and so proved the *rightness* of his position, without affording any *insight* into the peculiar nature of it. Thus the mind that

hungered after truth, was fed at the table, but as it were, in a dream, without either palate or stomach being anywise the better for it.'—p. 14.

'The evil most directly flowing from such a method of philosophizing, was that of a too external and mechanical consideration and treatment of the truths of religion. Under such a method, Christian truth could not be brought forward in the *spirit;* everything became stiff and formal, while the everlasting defining and syllogizing could not but chill the heart. It is undoubtedly to Wolfianism that we are to trace, in great measure, that coldness and lifelessness which characterizes the sermons of the latter part of the preceding century. The keen Wolfians went even so far as to interweave their 'technical terms' into their sermonizing: 'the Being who comprehends all worlds at once,' (God,) 'the connexion of things,' (*harmonia præstabilita,*) 'the sufficient reason,' (*ratio sufficiens,*) and such like, are phrases thus introduced. Nay, they did not even shrink from such insipid and absurd definitions as the following:—In Matt. viii. 1, it is said, 'But when Jesus came down from the mount,' on which one preacher remarks, 'A mountain is of such an elevated nature that, &c.;' again, verse 3, 'Jesus put forth his hand,' on which the comment is, 'A hand is a member of such a kind that, &c.' In the Wertheimer Bible, on Lev. xviii. 7, 'She is thy mother,' the note is, 'A mother is a woman who, in conjunction with her husband, conceives and brings up children, &c.' This is what they called 'philosophic clearness!' . . . Of still greater moment was the effect of the distinction prominently brought forward anew by Wolf, between natural and revealed religion, especially in connexion with the assertion that it belonged to the former to demonstrate, while the latter was simply to be believed. What more natural than that people should incline to abide by that which was susceptible of demonstration, especially when the English deists come in to show that most of what men had been wont to believe was incredible?'—pp. 17, 18.

We have dwelt the more fully on this part of Dr. Tholuck's essay, from a conviction that there is much in the remarks we have extracted, which is deserving of the consideration of preachers and theologians in this country. Is it not to be feared that an over-love of logical precision has done harm to the cause of real religion and sound biblical knowledge amongst us, as well as led many minds to the verge of scepticism, if not beyond it? At any rate it cannot be denied, that from some of the sermons and comments on Scripture with which our own literature teems, it would not be difficult to produce specimens of equal twaddle in the shape of 'clear statement,' with those furnished above by

Dr. Tholuck, from the works of Germans; and if he be correct, as we think he is, in adjudging to the prevalence of such sort of teaching, no small influence in favour of infidelity, it becomes us to take the hint, and to use all proper means for raising the tone of public religious instruction, so as to keep it in full harmony with the advancing intelligence of the age.

The *second* element to which our author ascribes a powerful influence on German theology, is that referred to in the close of the last extract, viz. the diffusion through that country of the writings of the English deists, especially those of Toland and his followers. English theological literature of all kinds was about the middle of the last century much read in Germany; the principal works both for and against orthodox religion were translated either into German or Latin; and treatises either in support or in censure of the doctrines they contained were poured forth with truly Germanic profusion.* The effect of all this on the already Wolfianized mind of the rising ministry, was to imbue it with those principles of rationalism so fully and so ingeniously advocated in the deistical writings with which at that time our literature so unhappily abounded. It is curious, we may remark in passing, to find multitudes in this country regarding German rationalism as a new and previously unheard-of form of infidelity, whereas it has hardly a principle which is not to be found in some shape or other in the writings of the English deists of the last century. 'It would,' says Tholuck, 'well repay the trouble to collect the opinions of the English deists in the different departments of [biblical] criticism, exegesis, dogmatics, morals, and church history; we should be then convinced how few rationalist views belong exclusively to recent times, and how unfounded is the assertion of Bretschneider, that it is to the prodigious advances of science in the nineteenth century that rationalism is to be traced.'—p. 24.

The *third* element of evil influencing German theology during the latter half of the last century, arose from the writings of Voltaire and his school in France. The effect produced by these, however, was not very great. 'Here and there, certainly, the perusal of the French writers occasioned pernicious effects on the German divines, but only on such as, independent of this, were inclined to a moral laxity.' 'I learned,' says Laukhard, 'from Voltaire only to scoff; other books, especially Tindal's work, had put me in a position to judge correctly, as I view the matter, of dogmas and church religions, &c.'

The *last* element in this fourfold influence, was the infidelity

* Tholuck mentions that Toland's 'Christianity not mysterious,' received fifty-four replies; his 'Amyntor,' twenty-nine; and his 'Christianity as Old as the Creation,' no less than one hundred and six!

of Frederick the Great, and the activity of his minister, Zedlitz, to put down the Pietists, and fill all the pulpits and chairs with those who had imbibed principles congenial with his own and the king's. Frederick's opposition to piety amounted to a positive hatred of all who showed any signs of respect for it. Nay, he could not even bear the name! A person of the name of Frommann, (good-man,) having been appointed to an office, the persons around the king dared never utter his true name, but had to change it into Frohmann, (glad-man!) Zedlitz was the friend and correspondent of Bahrdt, and on the removal of that depraved and unhappy man from his office as superintendent at Leiningen for crimes of the worst kind, he wrote to him a letter of condolence, in which he expresses his joy that the wretch had found an asylum in Prussia. *Ex ungue leonem!* Zedlitz, however, was politician enough to see that such grossly immoral conduct as that of Bahrdt could not but be injurious to the cause of freethinking. Therefore, in a subsequent letter he wrote thus: — 'Your own good sense fully more than my entreaties will satisfy you that you must *as yet* [mark this!] be externally decent in your conduct, lest you lead people to suppose, what many are fain to believe, that freethinking is rather the result of the lust of the heart, than of the conviction of the understanding.' As Tholuck remarks, 'truly an important saying!' When it is known that Zedlitz was minister of religious affairs for sixteen years, it is easy to see how extensive must have been the injury which his appointments and influence would produce on the theological opinions of the Germans.

These influences conspired to prepare the way for the great apostle of Rationalism in Germany, Semler—'a man who without founding any school of his own, yet carried the torch from which sparks darted upon the tinder which on every hand was scattered among his contemporaries, and kindled a blaze which continues to the present moment.'—p. 39. Semler was a man naturally of an eager, sanguine, and restless temperament; capable of prodigious literary toil; a perfect *helluo librorum*, 'whose appetite was unbounded, and whose delight it was rather to cram than to eat;' and one whom no dread of consequences withheld from uttering whatever opinions he for the moment might have embraced. Starting from the ground occupied by his master, Baumgarten, he recklessly followed out his course, now overturning the foundations of all faith and godliness by his writings, and anon 'singing psalms for the elevation of his heart, praying with his wife, and exchanging mutual exhortations with her to resolve to fear God and keep his commandments.' Into the character, history, and influence of this extraordinary man, Dr. Tholuck enters very fully. We must content ourselves with ex-

tracting a few of his remarks on the rationalistic tendency of Semler's labours in the different departments of theological science:—

'The first field in which Semler attempted his reform was that of biblical criticism. His recklessness appears here in his readiness, wherever the readings diverge, and more words are used than are absolutely necessary for the meaning, to treat the passage as a gloss. He allowed his peculiar dogmatical views also to influence his judgment of readings; thus he throws out the καὶ from 2 Tim. iii. 16, in order to favour the translation of θεόπνευστος as an adjective, and not as the predicate; so, also, he adopts the Socinian reading of Rom. ix. 5, &c. His acute but arbitrary hypotheses concerning the Appendices to the Epistle to the Romans, and the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, have also produced no small critical effect. But it is in the department of the higher criticism that his researches were chiefly important. His principle here is thus stated by himself: 'The only proof of the Divine Authority of a book arises from the internal conviction produced by the truths therein contained; that is the *fides divina* which people, for brevity's sake, and also to have the advantage of a biblical though somewhat obscure mode of speech, have called the testimony of the Holy Spirit in the mind of the reader.' Following the guidance of this rule, he dismissed from the canon the Song of Solomon, and the books of Ruth, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, and Chronicles; treated Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, and Daniel, as doubtful; and decided that it was uncertain whether Ecclesiastes was not the work of several hands. With regard to the Pentateuch, he adopted the hypotheses of Simon and Vitringa, that it, especially the first book, Genesis, was composed of fragments sorted together, and whose age is uncertain; he supposed that the copies of the Pentateuch extant at the time of the Babylonish captivity would be destroyed or injured by that event, and that they were again restored by Ezra, which would account for the different recensions, as Ezra had no authority among the Samaritans, and also for the fact that the Christians preferred the Greek translation to the Hebrew copies. The exclusion of so many books from the canon, not on grounds of *historical* evidence against them, but from *dogmatical* opposition to them, led to consequences of ominous import to the greater part of the Old Testament. The application of the same rule to the New Testament materially unsettled the canon of it also, for Semler decided on its books according as he judged them serviceable to moral improvement or not. More than any other, he opposed the Apocalypse, which he set himself with all his might to prove to be the work of some fanatical chiliastic visionary. With regard to the Gospels, his criticism tended to throw doubt on their integrity and credibility, besides representing them as written only for Jews, and calculated to be useful to them alone. From this charge, he partially exempted the Gospel by John, which, as more free from a Jewish spirit, he deemed more valuable to us. The miracles and prophecies of the Evangelists he treated as mere accommodations to Jewish predilections. On the other hand, he viewed Paul's epistles

as anti-Judaic, because they lay weight, not on *miracles* and *history*, (that, according to Semler, is the σάρξ,) but on the Christian doctrine, (according to him, the πνεῦμα.)'

'With these critical views of the New-Testament writings is closely associated his leading exegetical principle—viz., the merely local and temporary character of the whole of the Old and New Testaments. To this is to be traced the chief mischief of which he was the instrument in theological science. His own applications of the principle indeed did not meet with much favour; but the method which he introduced was congenial to the spirit of the times, and was eagerly adopted. A dislike to positive dogmas, a contempt for the previously-used *dicta probantia*, the zeal of the popular philosophy to reduce all Christian ideas to her doctrine of the sound human understanding, the Kantian philosophy, which announced the uselessness of the biblical doctrines in their historical meaning, and sought to substitute for this a moral interpretation, the superficial modes of thought pervading the supernaturalism of that day—all conspired to render general that system of localizing and temporizing by which the Scriptures were robbed of all objective and permanent truths. What influence such a mode of explaining Scripture must have had on dogmatical science it is easy to conceive. An exegesis which could find in the New Testament nothing but what was local and temporal, cut from dogmatics the root from which its life-powers were to be drawn. According to Semler, all the dogmatical doctrines of Holy Scriptures are either accommodations to Jewish prejudices—'little local ideas,' as he delighted to call them (and among the rest, he put under this head the colossal idea of the kingdom of God!); or it is impossible now to say what ideas are included under certain biblical phrases and terms, such as 'the Son of God,' 'Mediator,' 'justification,' &c.; so that all we have to care for is to make the best use we can of the Bible doctrines for our own 'improvement.' It is obvious that with such views there is nothing positive, which in a system of Christian dogmatics can be affirmed, and it is only a natural consequence of the Semlerian ideas, when rationalistic dogmatists, like Henke, Wegscheider, and Bretschneider, occupy themselves only with the examination of the historical material, and the modification of the opinions and principles of Jewish theology, which lies at the basis of the Christian doctrines.

'In the department of church history, the aim of Semler was to place the condition of the early Christians, the circumstances of the church, and the character of those fathers, especially, who were defenders of orthodoxy, in the worst light possible. Tertullian is with him 'quite outré,' and 'fanatical;' Augustine is 'a hair-splitter;' and Bernard, though 'here and there he has good ideas,' is on the whole a mere 'bigoted devotee.' Even Chrysostom and Theodoret are represented in the most startling lights whenever they utter anything not quite accordant with the views of the 18th century. Semler thus laboured to produce an impression of how little fruit Christianity had in so many centuries yielded, and how many crazy fanatics had acquired a famous name in theology. Such was the contempt for the study of

church history produced by his efforts, that his friend Hofrath Schutz, the well-known lover of good jokes, lamented nothing so much as that there was no especial Joe Miller collected out of the Fathers, and Bahrdt proposed to the Minister Zedlitz to confine the studies of the young theologians in church history to a selection of the principal data and a manual of the most striking absurdities of all times, to serve as a warning for the present.'—pp. 54—73.

Such was the unhallowed influence of Semler on the theological opinions of his countrymen. Unhappily, there were too many whose minds were already prepared to catch fire from the sparks which he plentifully emitted; else probably he would have passed away without producing any great effect, for his personal influence was so small that, as already remarked, he never was able to form a school, or collect any who ranked themselves as his followers. The ice, however, had been courageously broken, and immediately multitudes, who before stood shivering between desire and dread, plunged after him into the dark and polluted stream of Neologian infidelity. Dr. Tholuck enumerates with much care the names in the different universities of the leading men who gave their support and countenance to the new doctrines. A melancholy list it is! with the detestable Bahrdt* at the head of it; yet, alas, embracing many great names! Indeed for many years all the distinguished names for learning and genius in Germany were on the side of Rationalism. Happily, the tide is now strongly, and we hope effectually, turned,—thanks, under God, to such men as Tholuck, Neander, Hengstenberg, Olshausen, and others of the same class!

Of the remaining treatises in the second volume of the work before us, the most valuable are, the one on 'the Writings, Character, and Life of Paul,' and the one on 'the Services of Calvin, as an Interpreter of the Sacred Writings.' Both of these are accessible to the English reader in the pages of the 'American Biblical Repository.' The former has also appeared in a late number of the 'Edinburgh Biblical Cabinet.' They do not therefore require to be particularly noticed in the present article.

We conclude our notice of these volumes by expressing the cordial satisfaction with which we have perused them, and our earnest prayer that their excellent author may be long spared to help forward and to witness the complete triumphs of evangelical religion in Germany over all those forms of delusion, and over that 'science,' falsely so called, which for many years have influenced so perniciously the minds of theologians, and through them, the minds of all classes of the community in that country.

* After a career of unblushing profligacy, and after having been expelled from three situations successively for misconduct, this unhappy man died at Halle, in 1792, of a syphilitic disorder of the most aggravated kind.

Art. III. *The Bible in Spain; or the Journeys, Adventures, and Imprisonments of an Englishman, in an attempt to circulate the Scriptures in the Peninsula.* By George Borrow. In three volumes. London: J. Murray. 1843.

Mr. Borrow's former work on 'The Gipsies of Spain,' supersedes the necessity of any formal introduction of him to our readers. The extensive circulation of that work, and the peculiar interest it excited, have done far more to secure him a favourable reception than could be insured by any commendation of ourselves and brother critics. The volumes now before us are amongst the most bewitching which have for a long time come under our notice. They are distinguished by the same general characteristics as their predecessors, and cannot fail, by the variety and interest of their details, the light they throw on the condition of numerous sections of the Spanish people, the personal adventures they narrate, and the melancholy revelation which they afford of the ignorance and irreligion universally prevalent throughout the Peninsula, to engage the sympathy and deepest interest of their readers. Mr. Borrow's visit to Spain was in the service of the Bible Society, and the work now offered to the public consists of a narrative of what befel him during his residence in that country 'as its agent, for the purpose of printing and circulating the Scriptures.' 'It is founded,' he tells us, 'on certain journals which I kept during my stay in Spain, and numerous letters written to my friends in England, which they had subsequently the kindness to restore.' His mode of procedure was altogether unique, free from the trammels of official etiquette, and such as many of our modern prudes will regard as wanting in decorum and dignity. Though suddenly called to the work, he was not unprepared for his mission. 'In the day dreams of my boyhood,' he says, 'Spain always bore a considerable share, and I took a particular interest in her without any presentiment that I should at a future time be called upon to take a part, however humble, in her strange dramas; which interest at a very early period led me to acquire her noble language, and to make myself acquainted with her literature (scarcely worthy of the language), her history, and condition, so that when I entered Spain for the first time, I felt more at home than I should otherwise have done.' His residence in Spain, which extended to five years, is consequently pronounced the most happy period of his existence, and her peasantry are affirmed to be yet distinguished by qualities which place them vastly above her higher classes. 'Amongst the peasantry of Spain,' remarks our author, 'I found my sturdiest supporters; and yet the holy father supposes that the Spanish labourers are friends and lovers of his.'

Mr. Borrow entered the Tagus during the night of the 11th of November, 1835, and found, as other foreigners have done before, disembarkation at Lisbon to be a matter of considerable vexation, owing to the incivility of the Custom-house officers, and the provoking minuteness with which their examination of his baggage was conducted. His first excursion was to Cintra, on the historical associations of which, he dilates with an interest which betokens the peculiar temperament of his mind. The peasantry of Portugal were found to be awfully ignorant, even of the simplest facts of Scripture history. At Mafra, a large village not far from Cintra, our author met with 'a fine intelligent looking lad,' respecting whom he informs us:—

'I asked the boy whether he or his parents were acquainted with the Scripture and ever read it; he did not, however, seem to understand me. I must here observe that the boy was fifteen years of age, that he was in many respects very intelligent, and had some knowledge of the Latin language; nevertheless, he knew not the Scripture even by name, and I have no doubt, from what I subsequently observed, that at least two-thirds of his countrymen are on that important point no wiser than himself. At the doors of village inns, at the hearths of the rustics, in the fields where they labour, at the stone fountains by the wayside where they water their cattle, I have questioned the lower class of the children of Portugal about the Scripture, the Bible, the Old and New Testament, and in no one instance have they known what I was alluding to, or could return me a rational answer, though on all other matters their replies were sensible enough; indeed, nothing surprised me more than the free and unembarrassed manner in which the Portuguese peasantry sustain a conversation, and the purity of the language in which they express their thoughts, and yet few of them can read or write; whereas, the peasantry of England, whose education is in general much superior, are in their conversation coarse, and dull almost to brutality, and absurdly ungrammatical in their language, though the English tongue is upon the whole more simple in its structure than the Portuguese.'—Vol. i., pp. 19, 20.

As Spain was the special sphere of his mission, Mr. Borrow did not long remain in Portugal. He journeyed on mules, attended by a servant, and passed through a wild broken country, whose reputation was far from being attractive. At the ruins of Vendas Velhas, formerly the haunt of a noted banditti, Sabocha, he recognised the vestiges of a fire, betokening the recent presence of robbers, on which he characteristically remarks, 'I left a New Testament and some tracts amongst the ruins, and hastened away.' As he approached the frontier, Mr. Borrow fell in with several Spanish contrabandistas, with whom he mixed freely, and much to the advantage of his mission. This was specially the case at the small city of Evora, as will appear from the following extract:—

'Wednesday was stormy, with occasional rain. On coming down, I found that my friend from Palmella had departed; but several contrabandistas had arrived from Spain. They were mostly fine fellows, and, unlike the two I had seen the preceding week, who were of much lower degree, were chatty and communicative; they spoke their native language, and no other, and seemed to hold the Portuguese in great contempt. The magnificent tones of the Spanish sounded to great advantage amidst the shrill squeaking dialect of Portugal. I was soon in deep conversation with them, and was much pleased to find that all of them could read. I presented the eldest, a man of about fifty years of age, with a tract in Spanish. He examined it for some time with great attention; he then rose from his seat, and going into the middle of the apartment, began reading it aloud, slowly and emphatically; his companions gathered around him, and every now and then expressed their approbation of what they heard. The reader occasionally called upon me to explain passages which, as they referred to particular texts of Scripture, he did not exactly understand, for not one of the party had ever seen either the Old or New Testament.

'He continued reading for upwards of an hour, until he had finished the tract; and, at its conclusion, the whole party were clamorous for similar ones, with which I was happy to be able to supply them.

'Most of these men spoke of priestcraft and the monkish system with the utmost abhorrence, and said that they should prefer death to submitting again to the yoke which had formerly galled their necks. I questioned them very particularly respecting the opinion of their neighbours and acquaintances on this point, and they assured me that in their part of the Spanish frontier all were of the same mind, and that they cared as little for the Pope and his monks as they did for Don Carlos; for the latter was a dwarf (*chicotito*) and a tyrant, and the others were plunderers and robbers. I told them they must beware of confounding religion with priestcraft, and that in their abhorrence of the latter, they must not forget that there is a God and a Christ to whom they must look for salvation, and whose word it was incumbent upon them to study on every occasion; whereupon they all expressed a devout belief in Christ and the Virgin.

'These men, though in many respects more enlightened than the surrounding peasantry, were in others as much in the dark; they believed in witchcraft and in the efficacy of particular charms. The night was very stormy, and at about nine we heard a galloping towards the door, and then a loud knocking; it was opened, and in rushed a wild looking man, mounted on a donkey; he wore a ragged jacket of sheep-skin, called in Spanish, zamarra, with breeches of the same as far down as his knees; his legs were bare. Around his sombrero, or shadowy hat, was tied a large quantity of the herb, which in English is called rosemary, in Spanish romero, and in the rustic language of Portugal, alecrim, which last is a word of Scandinavian origin (*elle-gren*), signifying the elfin plant, and was probably carried into the south by the Vandals. The man seemed frantic with terror, and said that the witches had been pursuing him and hovering over his head

for the last two leagues. He came from the Spanish frontier with meal and other articles; he said that his wife was following him and would soon arrive, and in about a quarter of an hour she made her appearance, dripping with rain, and also mounted on a donkey.

'I asked my friends, the contrabandistas, why he wore the rosemary in his hat, whereupon they told me that it was good against witches and the mischances on the road. I had no time to argue against this superstition, for, as the chaise was to be ready at five the next morning, I wished to make the most of the short time which I could devote to sleep.'—Ib., pp. 63—66.

Amongst the rocks near Estremoz, our author's attention was arrested by 'a pile of stones of rather a singular appearance,' and, as was to be expected from such a traveller, he rode up to inspect it. His reflections are too illustrative of his mental character to be omitted. They are brief, and we give them entire.

'It was a druidical altar, and the most perfect and beautiful one of the kind which I had ever seen. It was circular, and consisted of stones immensely large and heavy at the bottom, which towards the top became thinner and thinner, having been fashioned by the hand of art to something of the shape of scollop shells. These were surmounted by a very large flat stone, which slanted down towards the south, where was a door. Three or four individuals might have taken shelter within the interior, in which was growing a small thorn tree.

'I gazed with reverence and awe upon the pile where the first colonists of Europe offered their worship to the unknown God. The temples of the mighty and skilful Roman, comparatively of modern date, have crumbled to dust in its neighbourhood. The churches of the Arian Goth, his successor in power, have sunk beneath the earth, and are not to be found; and the mosques of the Moor, the conqueror of the Goth, where and what are they? Upon the rock, masses of hoary and vanishing ruin. Not so the Druid's stone; there it stands on the hill of winds, as strong and as freshly new as the day, perhaps thirty centuries back, when it was first raised, by means which are a mystery. Earthquakes have heaved it, but its cope-stone has not fallen; rain floods have deluged it, but failed to sweep it from its station; the burning sun has flashed upon it, but neither split nor crumbled it; and time, stern old time, has rubbed it with his iron tooth, and with what effect let those who view it declare. There it stands, and he who wishes to study the literature, the learning, and the history of the ancient Celt and Cymbrian, may gaze on its broad covering, and glean from that blank stone the whole known amount. The Roman has left behind him his deathless writings, his history, and his songs; the Goth his liturgy, his traditions, and the germs of noble institutions; the Moor his chivalry, his discoveries in medicine, and the foundations of modern commerce; and where is the memorial of the Druidic races? Yonder: that pile of eternal stone!'—Ib., pp. 119—121.

At Badajoz, Mr. Borrow met with the gipsy Antonio, so familiar to the readers of his former work, and an offer on the part of this singular man to be his guide was too tempting to be resisted. 'Few people,' he remarks, 'would have accepted the offer of this singular gipsy. It was not, however, without its allurements for me. I was fond of adventure, and what more ready means of gratifying my love of it than by putting myself under the hands of such a guide.' Indeed, it is very obvious, from the whole narrative, that there was a peculiar charm to our author in the character and habits of this people, so that we are anything but surprised at being told that he felt himself much more at home with them than 'with the silent reserved men of Spain.' Under the surveillance of Antonio, he proceeded towards the Spanish capital,—a singular conjunction of travellers, such, perhaps, as was never witnessed before, and as, most surely, will not often be repeated. Mr. Borrow was mounted on a white horse, short in the body, with remarkably long legs; 'the most uncouth animal,' he says, 'I had ever beheld,' while Antonio followed on a mule. The adventures encountered were such as a pair of gipsies—for our author was taken to be one—might expect in Spain, the land of superstition and banditti. On one occasion they arrived at Trujillo three hours after sunset, thoroughly exhausted by the fatigues of the day; but on reaching the 'low mean hut,' where Antonio expected to be housed, the inmates were found to be from home, and the house itself carefully locked up. This was no pleasant discovery, and matters were made much worse on our author being informed by the gipsy, that there was no other house in the town into which he dared venture. No alternative was left, save to discard his guide, or to continue his route. To the latter he was much disinclined, but Antonio decided the matter by springing on his mule, and leading the way out of the town. What followed is worthy of the days of romance, and will be best told in Mr. Borrow's own words:—

'I confess I did not much like this decision of the gipsy; I felt very slight inclination to leave the town behind, and to venture into unknown places in the dark night, amidst rain and mist, for the wind had now dropped, and the rain began again to fall briskly. I was, moreover, much fatigued, and wished for nothing better than to deposit myself in some comfortable manger, where I might sink to sleep, lulled by the pleasant sound of horses and mules despatching their provender. I had, however, put myself under the direction of the gipsy, and I was too old a traveller to quarrel with my guide under the present circumstances. I therefore followed close at his crupper, our only light being the glow emitted from the gipsy's cigar; at last he flung it from his mouth into a puddle, and we were then in darkness.

'We proceeded in this manner for a long time; the gipsy was silent; I myself was equally so; the rain descended more and more. I sometimes thought I heard doleful noises, something like the hooting of owls. 'This is a strange night to be wandering abroad in,' I at length said to Antonio.

''It is, brother,' said he; 'but I would sooner be abroad in such a night, and in such places, than in the estaripel of Trujillo.'

'We wandered at least a league farther, and appeared now to be near a wood, for I could occasionally distinguish the trunks of immense trees. Suddenly Antonio stopped his mule: 'Look, brother,' said he, 'to the left, and tell me if you do not see a light; your eyes are sharper than mine.' I did as he commanded me. At first I could see nothing; but moving a little farther on, I plainly saw a large light at some distance, seemingly amongst the trees. 'Yonder cannot be a lamp or candle,' said I; 'it is more like the blaze of a fire.' 'Very likely,' said Antonio. 'There are no queres (*houses*) in this place; it is doubtless a fire made by durotunes (*shepherds*); let us go and join them, for, as you say, it is doleful work wandering about at night amidst rain and mire.'

'We dismounted, and entered what I now saw was a forest, leading the animals cautiously amongst the trees and brushwood. In about five minutes we reached a small open space, at the farther side of which, at the foot of a large cork tree, a fire was burning, and by it stood or sat two or three figures; they had heard our approach, and one of them now exclaimed Quien vive? 'I know that voice,' said Antonio, and leaving the horse with me, rapidly advanced towards the fire: presently I heard an Ola! and a laugh, and soon the voice of Antonio summoned me to advance. On reaching the fire, I found two dark lads, and a still darker woman of about forty; the latter seated on what appeared to be horse or mule furniture. I likewise saw a horse and two donkeys tethered to the neighbouring trees. It was, in fact, a Gipsy bivouac . . . . 'Come forward, brother, and show yourself,' said Antonio to me; 'you are amongst friends; these are of the Errate, the very people whom I expected to find at Trujillo, and in whose house we should have slept.'

''And what,' said I, 'could have induced them to leave their house in Trujillo and come into this dark forest, in the midst of wind and rain, to pass the night?'

''They come on business of Egypt, brother, doubtless,' replied Antonio; 'and that business is none of ours, Calla boca! It is lucky we have found them here, else we should have had no supper, and our horses no corn.'

''My ro is prisoner at the village yonder,' said the woman, pointing with her hand in a particular direction; 'he is prisoner yonder for choring a mailla (*donkey*); we are come to see what we can do in his behalf; and where can we lodge better than in this forest, where there is nothing to pay? It is not the first time, I trow, that Caloré have slept at the root of a tree.'

'One of the striplings now gave us barley for our animals in a large

bag, into which we successively introduced their heads, allowing the famished creatures to regale themselves till we conceived that they had satisfied their hunger. There was a puchero simmering at the fire, half full of bacon, garbanzos, and other provisions; this was emptied into a large wooden platter, and out of this Antonio and myself supped; the other gipsies refused to join us, giving us to understand that they had eaten before our arrival; they all, however, did justice to the leathern bottle of Antonio, which, before his departure from Merida, he had the precaution to fill.

'I was by this time completely overcome with fatigue and sleep. Antonio flung me an immense horse cloth, of which he bore more than one beneath the huge cushion on which he rode; in this I wrapped myself, and placing my head upon a bundle, and my feet as near as possible to the fire, I lay down.

'Antonio and the other gipsies remained seated by the fire conversing. I listened for a moment to what they said, but I did not perfectly understand it, and what I did understand by no means interested me; the rain still drizzled, but I heeded it not, and was soon asleep.

'The sun was just appearing as I awoke. I made several efforts before I could rise from the ground; my limbs were quite stiff, and my hair was covered with rime, for the rain had ceased, and a rather severe frost set in. I looked around me, but could see neither Antonio nor the gipsies; the animals of the latter had likewise disappeared, so had the horse which I had hitherto rode; the mule, however, of Antonio still remained fastened to the tree; this latter circumstance quieted some apprehensions which were beginning to arise in my mind. 'They are gone on some business of Egypt,' I said to myself, 'and will return anon.' I gathered together the embers of the fire, and heaping upon them sticks and branches, soon succeeded in calling forth a blaze, beside which I again placed the puchero, with what remained of the provision of last night. I waited for a considerable time in expectation of the return of my companions, but as they did not appear, I sat down and breakfasted. Before I had well finished, I heard the noise of a horse approaching rapidly, and presently Antonio made his appearance amongst the trees, with some agitation in his countenance. He sprang from the horse, and instantly proceeded to untie the mule. 'Mount, brother, mount!' said he, pointing to the horse; 'I went with the Calle and her chabés to the village where the ro is in trouble; the chinobaro, however, seized them at once with their cattle, and would have laid hands also on me, but I set spurs to the grasti, gave him the bridle, and was soon far away. Mount, brother, mount, or we shall have the whole rustic canaille upon us in a twinkling.'—Ib., pp. 190—196.

Travelling at a rapid pace they soon came to Jaraicejo, where another singular adventure befel our author, the account of which our limits prevent our transcribing. For mutual safety, Mr. Borrow and his guide parted company before entering the town;

and it was well for the former, as the event proved, that they did so. 'Who are you, and whence do you come?' demanded one of the national guards, in a rough voice; and having received the information required, went on to say, 'I am told that a gipsy fellow just now rode through the town; it is well for him that I had stepped into my house.' Our author knew how to touch the vanity of the soldier, and admirable terms were in consequence established between them. His knowledge of human nature and of the Spanish character were admirably shown on the occasion, and his gravity must have been severely taxed when, on parting with the sentinel, the latter remarked, 'I am sorry that gipsy was permitted to pass; should you meet him, and not like his looks, shoot him at once, stab him, or ride him down. He is a well-known thief, contrabandista, and murderer, and has committed more assassinations than he has fingers on his hands.' Arrived at length at Madrid, Mr. Borrow waited on the British ambassador, Mr. Villiers, the present Earl of Clarendon, from whom he received the most polite and friendly attention. The services rendered by this distinguished member of the late administration, may well rebuke the fierce and indiscriminate hostility with which Lord Melbourne's government was assailed by a faction of political religionists. 'Though I had long been aware,' remarks Mr. Borrow, 'that Mr. Villiers was at all times willing to assist me, he having frequently given me sufficient proof, I could never expect that he would come forward in so noble, and to say the least of it, considering his high diplomatic situation, so bold and decided a manner. I believe that this was the first instance of a British ambassador having made the cause of the Bible Society a national one, or, indeed, of having favoured it directly or indirectly.' Mr. Villiers courteously tendered his aid to procure our author an interview with the Spanish minister, Mendizabal, at the same time informing him that he did not anticipate any good from the interview, as he knew the Spaniard 'to be violently prejudiced against the British and Foreign Bible Society.' Mr. Borrow was resolute in his purpose, and the English ambassador consequently gave him a letter of introduction to Mendizabal. The following account of the interview which ensued would be amusing, were it not for the deep gravity of the interests involved.

'Early one morning I repaired to the palace, in a wing of which was the office of the prime minister; it was bitterly cold, and the Guadarama, of which there is a noble view from the palace-plain, was covered with snow. For at least three hours I remained shivering with cold in an ante-room, with several other aspirants for an interview with the man of power. At last his private secretary made his ap-

pearance, and after putting various questions to the others, addressed himself to me, asking who I was, and what I wanted. I told him that I was an Englishman, and the bearer of a letter from the British minister. 'If you have no objection, I will myself deliver it to his Excellency,' said he; whereupon I handed it to him, and he withdrew. Several individuals were admitted before me; at last, however, my own turn came, and I was ushered into the presence of Mendizabal.

'He stood behind a table covered with papers, on which his eyes were intently fixed. He took not the slightest notice when I entered, and I had leisure enough to survey him. He was a huge athletic man, somewhat taller than myself, who measure six feet two without my shoes; his complexion was florid, his features fine and regular, his nose quite aquiline, and his teeth splendidly white; though scarcely fifty years of age, his hair was remarkably grey; he was dressed in a rich morning gown, with a gold chain round his neck, and morocco slippers on his feet.

'His secretary, a fine intellectual looking man, who, as I was subsequently informed, had acquired a name both in English and Spanish literature, stood at one end of the table with papers in his hands.

'After I had been standing about a quarter of an hour, Mendizabal suddenly lifted up a pair of sharp eyes, and fixed them upon me with a peculiarly scrutinizing glance.

'"I have seen a glance very similar to that amongst the Beni Israel," thought I to myself.

* * * * * *

'My interview with him lasted nearly an hour. Some singular discourse passed between us; I found him, as I had been informed, a bitter enemy to the Bible Society, of which he spoke in terms of hatred and contempt, and by no means a friend to the Christian religion, which I could easily account for. I was not discouraged, however, and pressed upon him the matter which brought me thither, and was eventually so far successful, as to obtain a promise, that at the expiration of a few months, when he hoped the country would be in a more tranquil state, I should be allowed to print the Scriptures.

'As I was going away he said, "Yours is not the first application I have had; ever since I have held the reins of government I have been pestered in this manner, by English calling themselves Evangelical Christians, who have of late come flocking over into Spain. Only last week a hunchbacked fellow found his way into my cabinet whilst I was engaged in important business, and told me that Christ was coming. * * * * And now you have made your appearance, and almost persuaded me to embroil myself yet more with the priesthood, as if they did not abhor me enough already. What a strange infatuation is this, which drives you over lands and waters with Bibles in your hands. My good sir, it is not Bibles we want, but rather guns and gunpowder, to put the rebels down with, and above all, money, that we may pay the troops; whenever you come with these three things you shall have a hearty welcome, if not, we really can dispense with your visits, however great the honour.'

Myself.—There will be no end to the troubles of this afflicted country until the gospel have free circulation.

'*Mendizabal.*—I expected that answer, for I have not lived thirteen years in England without forming some acquaintance with the phraseology of you good folks. Now, now, pray go; you see how engaged I am. Come again whenever you please, but let it not be within the next three months.'—Ib., pp. 239—243.

Little encouragement could be drawn from this interview, yet Mr. Borrow determined to persevere, and when Mendizabal subsequently retired from office, he waited on Isturitz, Galiano, and other members of the new administration, renewing his suit to be permitted to print the New Testament in Spanish. By some of these he was deemed 'a plaguy pestilent fellow,' but Galiano, the minister of marine, proved himself an unshaken friend, and at length suggested that he had better see the prime minister, Isturitz, and proceed to print, without waiting for a regular permission, which, he added, 'it does not appear that any one has authority to grant.' On this suggestion Mr. Borrow acted.

'I had an interview' he says, 'with Isturitz, at the palace, and for the sake of brevity I shall content myself with saying that I found him perfectly well-disposed to favour my views. 'I have lived long in England,' said he; 'the Bible is free there, and I see no reason why it should not be free in Spain also. I am not prepared to say that England is indebted for her prosperity to the knowledge which all her children, more or less, possess of the sacred writings; but of one thing I am sure, namely, that the Bible has done no harm in that country, nor do I believe that it will effect any in Spain; print it, therefore, by all means, and circulate it as extensively as possible.' I retired, highly satisfied with my interview, having obtained, if not a written permission to print the sacred volume, what, under all circumstances, I considered as almost equivalent, an understanding that my biblical pursuits would be tolerated in Spain; and I had fervent hope that whatever was the fate of the present ministry, no future one, particularly a liberal one, would venture to interfere with me, more especially as the English ambassador was my friend, and was privy to all the steps I had taken throughout the whole affair.

'Two or three things connected with the above interview with Isturitz struck me as being highly remarkable. First of all, the extreme facility with which I obtained admission to the presence of the prime minister of Spain. I had not to wait, or indeed to send in my name, but was introduced at once by the door-keeper. Secondly, the air of loneliness which pervaded the place, so unlike the bustle, noise, and activity which I observed when I waited on Mendizabal. In this instance, there were no eager candidates for an interview with the great man; indeed, I did not behold a single individual, with the exception of Isturitz and the official. But that which made the most profound

impression upon me, was the manner of the minister himself, who, when I entered, sat upon a sofa, with his arms folded, and his eyes directed to the ground. When he spoke, there was extreme depression in the tones of his voice, his dark features wore an air of melancholy, and he exhibited all the appearance of a person meditating to escape from the miseries of this life by the most desperate of all acts—suicide.'—Ib., pp. 284—286.

The revolution of the Granja, which followed within a week from the time of this interview, fully explained the depression noted by Mr. Borrow. It commenced at the Granja, or Grange, a royal country seat, about twelve leagues from the capital, whither the queen regent, Christina, had retired. On the following day Madrid was in motion, and our author, who was present on the occasion, gives the following animated account of what transpired:—

'The day after this event I entered the Puerta del Sol at about noon. There is always a crowd there about this hour, but it is generally a very quiet, motionless crowd, consisting of listless idlers calmly smoking their cigars, or listening to or retailing the—in general—very dull news of the capital; but on the day of which I am speaking the mass was no longer inert. There was much gesticulation and vociferation, and several people were running about shouting, '*Viva la constitucion!*' —a cry which, a few days previously, would have been visited on the utterer with death, the city having for some weeks past been subjected to the rigour of martial law. I occasionally heard the words, '*La Granja! La Granja!*' which words were sure to be succeeded by the shout of '*Viva la constitucion!*' Opposite the Casa de Postas were drawn up in a line about a dozen mounted dragoons, some of whom were continually waving their caps in the air and joining in the common cry, in which they were encouraged by their commander, a handsome young officer, who flourished his sword, and more than once cried out with great glee, 'Long live the constitutional queen! Long live the constitution!'

'The crowd was rapidly increasing, and several nationals made their appearance in their uniforms, but without their arms, of which they had been deprived, as I have already stated. 'What has become of the moderado government?' said I to Baltasar, whom I suddenly observed amongst the crowd, dressed as when I had first seen him, in his old regimental great coat and foraging cap; 'have the ministers been deposed and others put in their place?'

''Not yet, Don Jorge,' said the little soldier-tailor; 'not yet; the scoundrels still hold out, relying on the brute bull Quesada and a few infantry, who still continue true to them; but there is no fear, Don Jorge; the queen is ours, thanks to the courage of my friend Garcia, and if the brute bull should make his appearance—ho! ho! Don Jorge, you shall see something—I am prepared for him, ho! ho!' and thereupon he half opened his great coat, and showed me a small gun

which he bore beneath it in a sling, and then moving away with a wink and a nod, disappeared amongst the crowd.

'Presently I perceived a small body of soldiers advancing up the Calle Mayor, or principal street, which runs from the Puerta del Sol in the direction of the palace; they might be about twenty in number, and an officer marched at their head with a drawn sword; the men appeared to have been collected in a hurry, many of them being in fatigue dress, with foraging caps on their heads. On they came, slowly marching; neither their officer nor themselves paying the slightest attention to the cries of the crowd which thronged about them, shouting 'Long live the constitution!' save and except by an occasional surly side glance; on they marched with contracted brows and set teeth, till they came in front of the cavalry, where they halted and drew up in a rank.

'' Those men mean mischief,' said I to my friend D——, of the Morning Chronicle, who at this moment joined me; 'and depend upon it, that if they are ordered they will commence firing, caring nothing whom they hit,—but what can those cavalry fellows behind them mean, who are evidently of the other opinion by their shouting; why don't they charge at once this handful of foot people and overturn them? Once down, the crowd would wrest from them their muskets in a moment. You are a liberal, which I am not; why do you not go to that silly young man who commands the horse, and give him a word of counsel in time?'

'D—— turned upon me his broad red good-humoured English countenance, with a peculiarly arch look, as much as to say . . . . . (whatever you think most applicable, gentle reader,) then taking me by the arm, 'Let us get,' said he, 'out of this crowd and mount to some window, where I can write down what is about to take place, for I agree with you that mischief is meant.' Just opposite the post-office was a large house, in the topmost story of which we beheld a paper displayed, importing that apartments were to let; whereupon we instantly ascended the common stair, and having agreed with the mistress of the étage for the use of the front room for the day, we bolted the door, and the reporter, producing his pocket-book and pencil, prepared to take notes of the coming events, which were already casting their shadow before.

'What most extraordinary men are these reporters of newspapers in general, I mean English newspapers; surely if there be any class of individuals who are entitled to the appellation of cosmopolites, it is these; who pursue their avocation in all countries indifferently, and accommodate themselves at will to the manners of all classes of society; their fluency of style as writers is only surpassed by their facility of language in conversation, and their attainments in classical and polite literature only by their profound knowledge of the world, acquired by an early introduction into its bustling scenes. The activity, energy, and courage which they occasionally display in the pursuit of information, are truly remarkable. I saw them, during the three days at Paris, mingled with canaille and gamins behind the barriers, whilst

the mitraille was flying in all directions, and the desperate cuirassiers were dashing their fierce horses against these seemingly feeble bulwarks. There stood they, dotting down their observations in their pocket-books as unconcernedly as if reporting the proceedings of a reform meeting in Covent-garden or Finsbury-square; whilst in Spain, several of them accompanied the Carlist and Christino guerillas in some of their most desperate raids and expeditions, exposing themselves to the danger of hostile bullets, the inclemency of winter, and the fierce heat of the summer sun.

'We had scarcely been five minutes at the window, when we suddenly heard the clattering of horses' feet hastening down the street called the Calle de Carretas. The house in which we had stationed ourselves was, as I have already observed, just opposite to the post-office, at the left of which this street debouches from the north into the Puerta del Sol; as the sounds became louder and louder, the cries of the crowd below diminished, and a species of panic seemed to have fallen upon all; once or twice, however, I could distinguish the words, Quesada! Quesada! The foot soldiers stood calm and motionless, but I observed that the cavalry, with the young officer who commanded them, displayed both confusion and fear, exchanging with each other some hurried words; all of a sudden that part of the crowd which stood near the mouth of the Calle de Carretas fell back in great disorder, leaving a considerable space unoccupied, and the next moment Quesada, in complete general's uniform, and mounted on a bright bay thoroughbred English horse, with a drawn sword in his hand, dashed at full gallop into the area, in much the same manner as I have seen a Manchegan bull rush into the amphitheatre when the gates of his pen are suddenly flung open.

'He was closely followed by two mounted officers, and at a short distance by as many dragoons. In almost less time than is sufficient to relate it, several individuals in the crowd were knocked down and lay sprawling upon the ground beneath the horses of Quesada and his two friends, for as to the dragoons, they halted as soon as they had entered the Puerta del Sol. It was a fine sight to see three men, by dint of valour and good horsemanship, strike terror into at least as many thousands; I saw Quesada spur his horse repeatedly into the dense masses of the crowd, and then extricate himself in the most masterly manner. The rabble were completely awed and gave way, retiring by the Calle del Comercio and the street of Alcala. All at once, Quesada singled out two nationals, who were attempting to escape, and setting spurs to his horse, turned them in a moment and drove them in another direction, striking them in a contemptuous manner with the flat of his sabre. He was crying out, 'Long live the absolute queen!' when, just beneath me, amidst a portion of the crowd which had still maintained its ground, perhaps from not having the means of escaping, I saw a small gun glitter for a moment, then there was a sharp report, and a bullet had nearly sent Quesada to his long account, passing so near to the countenance of the general as to graze his hat. I had an indistinct view for a moment of a well-known foraging cap, just about

the spot from whence the gun had been discharged, then there was a rush of the crowd, and the shooter, whoever he was, escaped discovery amidst the confusion which arose.

'As for Quesada, he seemed to treat the danger from which he had escaped with the utmost contempt. He glared about him fiercely for a moment, then leaving the two nationals, who sneaked away like whipped hounds, he went up to the young officer who commanded the cavalry, and who had been active in raising the cry of the constitution, and to him he addressed a few words with an air of stern menace; the youth evidently quailed before him, and, probably in obedience to his orders, resigned the command of the party, and rode slowly away with a discomfited air; whereupon Quesada dismounted and walked slowly backwards and forwards before the Casa de Postas with a mien which seemed to bid defiance to mankind.'—Ib., pp. 288—297.

The triumph of Quesada was but short-lived. For one entire day he stopped the revolution; but the chiefs of the Moderado party were unequal to the crisis. They quailed before the storm, and sought refuge in flight. Quesada, disguised as a civilian, was recognised at a village about three leagues from Madrid, and being cast into prison, was soon after brutally murdered. Such is the worth of human glory, and so humiliating the lesson which its speedy eclipse reads us.

The government which followed was more liberal in its complexion than that of Isturitz, and Mr. Borrow consequently resolved to proceed at once to print his New Testament. An edition of five thousand was published within three months, and prompt measures were taken to secure its extensive circulation through the country. The mode by which our author proposed to accomplish his object is thus described, and it was unquestionably wise, as well as energetic:—

'I had determined, after depositing a certain number of copies in the shops of the booksellers of Madrid, to ride forth, Testament in hand, and endeavour to circulate the word of God amongst the Spaniards, not only of the towns but of the villages; amongst the children, not only of the plains, but of the hills and mountains. I intended to visit Old Castile, and to traverse the whole of Galicia and the Asturias,—to establish Scripture depots in the principal towns, and to visit the people in secret and secluded spots,—to talk to them of Christ, to explain to them the nature of his book, and to place that book in the hands of those whom I should deem capable of deriving benefit from it. I was aware that such a journey would be attended with considerable danger, and very possibly the fate of St. Stephen might overtake me; but does the man deserve the name of a follower of Christ who would shrink from danger of any kind in the cause of Him whom he calls his Master? 'He who loses his life for my sake, shall find it,' are words which the Lord himself uttered. These words

were fraught with consolation to me, as they doubtless are to every one engaged in propagating the gospel in sincerity of heart, in savage and barbarian lands,'—Vol. ii., pp. 7, 8.

At Salamanca, Mr. Borrow experienced the kindest hospitality from the inmates of the Irish College, and more especially from their head, Dr. Garland, an accomplished scholar, and high-minded gentleman. 'I am convinced,' remarks our traveller, 'that not all the authority of the pope or the cardinals would induce him to close his doors on Luther himself, were that respectable personage alive, and in need of food and refuge.' Similar instances of superiority to the prejudices of their class were occasionally met with in other parts of Spain, though in general the clergy were found to be ignorant, superstitious, and bigoted in the last degree. At Lugo, all his stock of Testaments —about thirty—were disposed of in a day, the bishop of the place purchasing two copies, and many of the priests and ex-friars speaking well of the book, and recommending its perusal. In other places, the bitterest hostility was evinced, and the bible missionary was compelled to seek safety in flight. The people, however, for the most part, hailed his appearance, and eagerly purchased the volume which is able to make wise unto salvation. A singular illustration of this occurred at Oviedo, which is too interesting to be omitted:—

'So it came to pass that one night I found myself in the ancient town of Oviedo, in a very large, scantily furnished, and remote room in an ancient posada, formerly a palace of the counts Santa Cruz. It was past ten, and the rain was descending in torrents. I was writing, but suddenly ceased on hearing numerous footsteps ascending the creaking stairs which led to my apartment. The door was flung open, and in walked nine men of tall stature, marshalled by a little hunch-backed personage. They were all muffled in the long cloaks of Spain, but I instantly knew by their demeanour that they were caballeros, or gentlemen. They placed themselves in a rank before the table where I was sitting. Suddenly and simultaneously they all flung back their cloaks, and I perceived that every one bore a book in his hand; a book which I knew full well. After a pause, which I was unable to break, for I sat lost in astonishment, and almost conceived myself to be visited by apparitions, the hunchback, advancing somewhat before the rest, said, in soft silvery tones, 'Señor Cavalier, was it you who brought this book to the Asturias?' I now supposed that they were the civil authorities of the place come to take me into custody, and, rising from my seat, I exclaimed, 'It certainly was I, and it is my glory to have done so; the book is the New Testament of God; I wish it was in my power to bring a million.' 'I heartily wish so too,' said the little personage, with a sigh. 'Be under no apprehension, Sir Cavalier, these gentlemen are my friends; we have just

purchased these books in the shop where you placed them for sale, and have taken the liberty of calling upon you, in order to return you our thanks for the treasure you have brought us. I hope you can furnish us with the Old Testament also.' I replied that I was sorry to inform him that at present it was entirely out of my power to comply with his wish, as I had no Old Testaments in my possession, but did not despair of procuring some speedily from England. He then asked me a great many questions concerning my biblical travels in Spain, and my success, and the views entertained by the society with respect to Spain, adding that he hoped we should pay particular attention to the Asturias, which he assured me was the best ground in the Peninsula for our labour. After about half an hour's conversation, he suddenly said, in the English language, 'Good night, Sir,' wrapped his cloak around him, and walked out as he had come. His companions, who had hitherto not uttered a word, all repeated 'Good night, Sir,' and, adjusting their cloaks, followed him.

'In order to explain this strange scene, I must state that in the morning I had visited the petty bookseller of the place, Longoria, and having arranged preliminaries with him, I sent him in the evening a package of forty Testaments, all I possessed, with some advertisements. At the time, he assured me that, though he was willing to undertake the sale, there was, nevertheless, not a prospect of success, as a whole month had elapsed since he had sold a book of any description, on account of the uncertainty of the times, and the poverty which pervaded the land; I therefore felt much dispirited. This incident, however, admonished me not to be cast down when things look gloomiest, as the hand of the Lord is generally then most busy; that men may learn to perceive, that whatever good is accomplished is not their work but His.' —Ib., pp. 326—329.

The Catholic clergy were at length thoroughly alarmed. They felt their craft to be in danger, and acted accordingly. An order was obtained from the Governor of Madrid, prohibiting the sale of the New Testament, and the active measures adopted proved that this order was not intended to remain a dead letter. They also sought the banishment of Mr. Borrow from Spain, but the minister, Count Ofalia, who had lent himself to their policy in the former instance, refused to grant them this request. From the British minister our author continued to receive the kindest and most valuable aid. 'Throughout this affair,' he says, 'I cannot find words sufficiently strong to do justice to the zeal and interest which Sir George Villiers displayed in the cause of the Testament.' One small section of the clergy, we are informed, was favourably disposed towards the circulation of the Divine word, though by no means inclined to make any sacrifice on its account. It consisted of such as were of liberal political views, and included several of the higher ecclesiastics. From these

latter Mr. Borrow at one time expected considerable assistance; 'but,' he remarks, 'I was soon undeceived, and became convinced that reliance on what they would effect was like placing the hand on a staff of reeds, which will only lacerate the flesh.'

Of the arrest and imprisonment of our author, which speedily followed, our space prevents our taking notice. It was a great blunder on the part of the Spanish authorities, for which they were called to a severe account by Sir George Villiers. His release was soon obtained, and with unwearied energy he resolved, as Madrid was closed against him, to undertake an excursion through the villages and plains, carrying with him the word of life for distribution. He soon found, however, that the mandate of his enemies had preceded him, and great difficulties were in consequence attendant on his mission. His stock of Testaments was seized, his person sometimes rudely treated, and his liberty and life were threatened. On one occasion he was preserved from falling into the hands of the incensed priests, in a manner which singularly illustrates the overruling providence of God. His account of the matter is as follows :—

'I started with Antonio at six in the evening, having early in the morning sent forward Lopez with between two and three hundred Testaments. We left the high road, and proceeded by a shorter way through wild hills and over very broken and precipitous ground; being well mounted, we found ourselves, just after sunset, opposite Ocana, which stands on a steep hill. A deep valley lay between us and the town; we descended, and came to a small bridge, which traverses a rivulet at the bottom of the valley, at a very small distance from a kind of suburb. We crossed the bridge, and were passing by a deserted house on our left hand, when a man appeared from under the porch.

'What I am about to state will seem incomprehensible, but a singular history and a singular people are connected with it; the man placed himself before my horse so as to bar the way, and said '*Schophon*,' which, in the Hebrew tongue, signifies a rabbit. I knew this word to be one of the Jewish countersigns, and asked the man if he had anything to communicate? He said, 'You must not enter the town, for a net is prepared for you. The corregidor of Toledo, on whom may all evil light, in order to give pleasure to the priests of Maria, in whose face I spit, has ordered all the alcaldes of these parts and the escribanos and the corchetes to lay hands on you wherever they may find you, and to send you, and your books, and all that pertains to you, to Toledo. Your servant was seized this morning in the town above, as he was selling the writings in the streets, and they are now awaiting your arrival in the posada; but I knew you from the accounts of my brethren, and I have been waiting here four hours to give you warning, in order that your horse may turn his tail to your enemies, and neigh

in derision of them. Fear nothing for your servant, for he is known to the alcalde, and will be set at liberty, but do you flee, and may God attend you.' Having said this, he hurried towards the town.

'I hesitated not a moment to take his advice, knowing full well that, as my books had been taken possession of, I could do no more in that quarter. We turned back in the direction of Aranjuez, the horses, notwithstanding the nature of the ground, galloping at full speed; but our adventures were not over. Midway, and about half a league from the village of Antigola, we saw close to us on our left hand three men on a low bank. As far as the darkness would permit us to distinguish, they were naked, but each bore in his hand a long gun. These were rateros, or the common assassins and robbers of the roads. We halted and cried out, 'Who goes there?' They replied, 'What's that to you? pass by.' Their drift was to fire at us from a position from which it would be impossible to miss. We shouted, 'If you do not instantly pass to the right side of the road, we will tread you down beneath the horses' hoofs.' They hesitated, and then obeyed, for all assassins are dastards, and the least show of resolution daunts them. As we galloped past, one cried, with an obscene oath, 'Shall we fire?' But another said 'No! hay peligro.' We reached Aranjuez, where early next morning Lopez rejoined us, and we returned to Madrid.

'I am sorry to state that two hundred Testaments were seized at Ocana, from whence, after being sealed up, they were despatched to Toledo. Lopez informed me, that in two hours he could have sold them all, the demand was so great. As it was, twenty-seven were disposed of in less than ten minutes.'—Vol. iii., pp. 126—129.

Great success attended the earlier stages of his rural mission, which so alarmed the clergy, that they made formal complaint to the government, 'who immediately sent orders to all the alcaldes of the villages, great and small, in New Castile, to seize the New Testament wherever it might be exposed for sale, but at the same time enjoining them to be particularly careful not to detain or maltreat the person or persons who might be attempting to vend it.'

The effects of this order were soon visible. Wherever the sacred volume was exhibited it was instantly seized, and Mr. Borrow was in consequence constrained to abandon his mission and return to Madrid. Persecuted in one place, he repaired to another, and with admirable promptitude resolved to concentrate his operations on the capital itself, hoping for a time to be concealed amidst its population. Ordinary men would have been dispirited at the vexatious opposition encountered, but Mr. Borrow was cast in a different mould, and therefore resolved to adapt his measures to the machinations of his opponents.

'I was not much discouraged,' he tells us, 'by this blow, which indeed did not come entirely unexpected. I, however, determined to

change the sphere of action, and not expose the sacred volume to seizure at every step which I should take to circulate it. In my late attempts, I had directed my attention exclusively to the villages and small towns, in which it was quite easy for the government to baffle my efforts by means of circulars to the local authorities, who would of course be on the alert, and whose vigilance it would be impossible to baffle, as every novelty which occurs in a small place is forthwith bruited about. But the case would be widely different amongst the crowds of the capital, where I could pursue my labours with comparative secrecy. My present plan was to abandon the rural districts, and to offer the sacred volume at Madrid, from house to house, at the same low price as in the country. This plan I forthwith put into execution.

'Having an extensive acquaintance amongst the lower orders, I selected eight intelligent individuals to co-operate with me, amongst whom were five women. All these I supplied with Testaments, and then sent them forth to all the parishes in Madrid. The result of their efforts more than answered my expectations. In less than fifteen days after my return from Naval Carnero, nearly six hundred copies of the life and words of Him of Nazareth had been sold in the streets and alleys of Madrid; a fact which I hope I may be permitted to mention with gladness and with decent triumph in the Lord.

'One of the richest streets is the Calle Montera, where reside the principal merchants and shopkeepers of Madrid. It is, in fact, the street of commerce, in which respect, and in being a favourite promenade, it corresponds with the far-famed 'Nefsky' of Saint Petersburg. Every house in the street was supplied with its Testament, and the same might be said with respect to the Puerta del Sol. Nay, in some instances, every individual in the house, man and child, man-servant and maid-servant, was furnished with a copy. My Greek, Antonio, made wonderful exertions in this quarter; and it is but justice to say that, but for his instrumentality on many occasions, I might have been by no means able to give so favourable an account of the spread of 'the Bible in Spain.' There was a time when I was in the habit of saying 'dark Madrid,' an expression which, I thank God, I could now drop. It were scarcely just to call a city 'dark,' in which thirteen hundred Testaments at least were in circulation, and in daily use.'—Ib., pp. 168—171.

Here we must reluctantlytake leave of Mr. Borrow, which we do with regret, and with sincere thanks for the pleasure we have derived from the perusal of his volumes. We need not say that we strongly recommend them to our readers.

Art. IV. *The Modern Pulpit viewed in its relation to Society.* By Robert Vaughan, D.D. London: Jackson and Walford. 1842.

Though this title is so general that it might have included a view of the pulpit of all faiths, in relation to the state of society in all countries, Dr. Vaughan has wisely confined his observations to the pulpit of our own country in the present age. His design is to awaken all Christians to a serious consideration of the state of the ministry as it now exists, and especially to the duty of looking well both to the capabilities of the aspirants towards the sacred office, and to the kind and degree of training for their work, which are demanded by the urgencies of the time.

We believe that many of our ablest and most accomplished ministers have already given a large measure of attention to this object. In those counsels which are usually addressed to young ministers at the public recognition of their office, the special claims of the various classes of society have been set forth of late years with much earnestness, and not a few of these able compositions have issued from the press. The charges of the baronial bishops, likewise, prove that they have not failed to acknowledge the necessity of infusing into the parochial ministry an energy suited to the changing scenes of the world around them.

The improvements that have taken place in the older colleges, and the projects for new institutions of this kind, may, moreover, be held as indications of a widely spread conviction that the modern pulpit is but very partially adapted to the present state of society, and that to make it so, many and combined efforts will be required.

We are informed in the preface to this volume, that it is the expansion of a sermon which the writer delivered at the annual meeting of Spring Hill College, Birmingham, in June last. He discusses in twelve successive chapters, of very unequal length, the following topics:—The Office of Preaching;—The General Characteristics of Modern Society;—The Manual-labour classes, and the Pulpit in relation to them;—The Middle Classes;—The Higher Classes;—Past History of the Pulpit;—A self-educated Ministry;—Elocution;—Divine Influence;—Scriptural connexion of personal religion with the ministerial office;—The Duty of Churches in relation to the Christian Ministry;—Points of caution necessary to Preachers and Hearers.

No thoughtful writer can approach this subject without perceiving on the threshold a considerable difficulty. He is in danger of seeming, at least, to depreciate the labours of holy and devoted ministers, who, with varying degrees of success, have

been tried and honoured in the performance of the duties which he is about to survey. Should a writer afford any ground for thinking that he regards the preaching of the present day as failing in any important particulars, there is a twofold evil which is likely to be produced. On one side he arrays against him, and against all the plans and institutions he may advocate, the personal feelings of an influential body of men, together with the stronger and more loudly expressed feelings of a considerable and not unhealthy portion of the Christian church; while, on the other side, he furnishes the censorious, the discontented, and the mischievous, with the weapons of a warfare, which, we fear, is but too bitterly and, alas, too successfully waged against the best and ablest men that have ever served the Christian church. We know that there are now living great numbers of preachers who, in the practical efficiency of their ministry, have not been surpassed in any former age, and who, in our humble judgment, are not likely to be greatly surpassed in any age to come; and, it may be said with simple truth and justice, that even in cases where that practical efficiency is not all that could be desired, the preachers themselves are sometimes the readiest to see and to lament it; but the circumstances in which they have been placed by the imprudence, selfishness, or ingratitude of others, are such, that their minds are distracted, their spirits sunk, and their ministry of necessity enfeebled. For ourselves, we should be sorely grieved to add to the sorrows of the already crushed heart, or to sanction, for a moment, the spirit of men whose principles are as opposed to the New Testament as the rankest popery that ever cursed mankind.

Those who are acquainted with Dr. Vaughan's previous publications, will scarcely suspect that a writer so discriminating, and of so much Christian temper, would be insensible to the delicacy of his task. Whatever perverse use may be made of his work by others, we certainly do not hold him in any degree responsible for it. He is not free only, but wise and considerate, in pointing out failures which the most intelligent must see, and in animadverting on faults which the most conscientious will confess;—and we cannot help saying that it is infinitely better that the modern position of the Christian pulpit should be fairly discussed by one who enjoys so deservedly the confidence of his brethren, than that it should either be slurred over as too delicate a question, or roughly handled by the enemies both of our religion and of our teachers.

In the manly and independent tone of this book we entirely sympathize. We think it is fitted, as well as intended, to do good. We hope it will be *studied*, as we are sure it deserves. It is evidently the fruit of much thought, and its general

arrangement discovers a clear mind and a philosophical habit. It is written in an easy, polished, and somewhat dignified style, and contains many passages of great strength and beauty. It unites breadth of view with graphic minuteness of detail, and pours into the reader's mind the treasures of learning, and the fruits of observation, in a stream of glowing patriotism. If there is not so ample a discussion as there might have been of the particular themes presented in almost every page, this forbearance is highly compensated by the value of the author's suggestions; while the condensation in which he has so happily succeeded secures for him a larger circle of readers than could have been expected for a costlier volume.

The pulpit derives much of its character from the state of society in times that have passed away. The systematic creeds, the modes of thought, the style of diction, even the elocutionary manner which prevailed in the days of our fathers, naturally and inevitably linger long among their children; and—since Christianity itself is divine, and because divine, unchangeable—men are apt to associate the same characters of divinity and permanence with every circumstance the most accidentally and remotely connected with it. Meanwhile, society around them obeys the great living law of change:—so that it is only by observing the working of this law, marking its certainty, tracing the mode of its development, and adapting the ministrations of the pulpit to the new state of things which is evolving, that the voice of the modern preacher can become the guide of the present generation. It is true, there were commanding, successful preachers in former times; and it is true, that in the precious remains of former thinkers the preachers of every succeeding time are furnished with the sacred oil that feeds the flames at once of their intelligence and of their devotion. But how did these men become what they were? By looking at society as it then passed before them; by studying the minds, characters, prejudices, and tendencies of their age; by adapting their vigorous and well-disciplined minds to the actual state of things,—thus giving to the pulpit the mental character of their own age, and stamping upon that age in return the impress of their own spirit. The true method, therefore, of walking in the footsteps of our fathers, is to cherish the same principles, and to propagate those principles with the same wise adaptation to actual society.

We may here observe, that no slender proof of the divine institution of the public ministry is afforded in its capacity of adjustment to the ever forward movement of society. Had its form been chiselled in the character of any past age, it must have become antiquated and obsolete long since. But He who appointed it, and laid down the axioms of its guidance in all

ages, had pre-ordained all the currents of our fluctuating world, and the swell of that great stream which carries, in the ripened fruits of harvests that are reaped, the germs of future springs.

To this grand series of progressions, He has committed his saving truth for the health of all nations;—and for the dispersing of that truth, he has cared that there shall be a renewed manifestation of intellectual and spiritual life in each successive age, bearing its own peculiar character, and doing its appropriate work.

Sublime, indeed, was the spectacle of our faith arising on the world, without the devices of human wisdom, and against the sanctions of human power:—but it was by neither weak-minded, nor weak-hearted men, that the Gospel challenged the philosopher of every sect in his own school, and drove away the priest of every superstition from his own altar. It was by wisdom, by power, by love, by every quality that constitutes a great and energetic character, that the first preachers of the cross prevailed. Theirs was the greatness of conscious truth, the energy of unconquerable love—truth speaking with authority to every man's conscience, love appealing with the soft and piercing fire of manly tenderness to every heart.

The inspiration which gave the truth was from God. The miracles which accredited the messengers were as seals from heaven. This truth abides with us. The record of these miracles—the visible stamp, as it were, of these seals—remains. And besides these, every preacher may now appeal to a body of proofs that the religion he teaches is divine, which warrant him to go to his work as fearlessly as the Apostles went to theirs; and every preacher is, or ought to be, filled with the same spirit of love which burned in the Apostles' hearts. We believe in apostolic succession; not in a fiction, but in substantial facts;—not in forms, but in realities;—not in pretensions, but in power. Rejecting sacraments, we believe in the Gospel. Denouncing priesthood, we reverence the ministry of enlightened and laborious men. Relying, as martyrs and apostles relied at first, on the Spirit of God, for the success of all preaching, our conviction is that the success has been proportioned to the *adaptation* of the preaching.

What is good preaching? Alas, how many answers would be given to this question! And yet is not the true answer—the preaching by which souls are saved? Then, the best preaching must be that by which the greatest number of souls are saved. In order to that end, however, men must be brought within the sphere of the pulpit; and to bring the greatest number of men within that sphere, is the design of Dr. Vaughan in his Treatise; and it is ours. In one word, what we specifically want in the

modern pulpit is—ADAPTATION. Now we have read a good deal in our time, not more than enough, of the necessity of adapting the efforts of the pulpit to the constitution of the human mind, to man's moral nature, to his actual condition as fallen, guilty, wretched, and exposed to future punishment. And not seldom have we read most seasonable injunctions, addressed to our younger ministers, on the personal adaptation of their discourses to the condition of individual men. All this we regard as of equal importance at all times, and in all conceivable circumstances. But at present, our aim is to excite as much attention as we can to this truth,—that along with these general and fixed adaptations, there is required a constantly varying adaptation to the constantly progressive changes of society.

Confining ourselves to society in our own country, we need scarcely remind our readers, that the aspects of British society are not what they were. Not only have they changed, but the change has been the result of so many and such slowly developed courses of events, that however suddenly some of its tokens may have flashed on the bewildered gaze of many, the *thing itself* is in the orderly path of providence.

It is not compatible with our limits to go over the wide field of modern society: for we could not content ourselves with a general and superficial sketch. We prefer urging on the attention of our readers, chiefly the largest and most neglected portion —the WORKING CLASSES.

There is a craving for change. The ancient bonds which held men in subordinate connexion with the classes above them, are visibly loosening. No longer is there the magic ascribed in former times to names. Little reverence is there for antiquity. Loyalty is neither so undefined nor so chivalrous. Submission is not so common. There is less and less admiration for the glitter of rank. Even wealth is not so devoutly worshipped, excepting as a private, or at most a household god.

Though education is still wretchedly defective, and abandoned to the casualties of private charity, or the rivalries of sectarian zeal, there is a much larger number of readers; and in this number there is a great increase of thinkers, and these thinkers utter their thoughts to willing hearers.

Then there are several new powers at work in society. Incredible facilities have been multiplied for diffusing opinions. The tendency to voluntary associations for all sorts of purposes, the best, the worst, the most frivolous, has assumed an activity and acquired a force which, while they make all men think, and some men fear, cannot be regarded by any wise or good man with indifference. The increase of *vice* in the great mass of our society is greater, and, as we think, in many respects more fear-

ful even than the progress of crime, which can be recorded and punished, and in a great degree checked by the laws.

That superstition in some quarters, and, still more, irreligion in others, are moving on at least as rapidly as this development of social powers, every man who opens his eyes on the daily course of things around him must be sufficiently convinced. Must we not add, that all these things are sharpened, and some of them quickened into life, by the people's terrible distress?—distress, which is patiently endured by some, we fear, from sheer exhaustion; by not a few, we are glad to know, from Christian principle; but by the majority, we have reason to think, because *they* believe they have the power and the right, in the last extremity, to force a change for the better.

Now, with some exceptions, which we are far from underrating either as to their number or as to their importance—over these masses, which are the roots and fibres of English society, the modern pulpit has no influence whatever.

We do not mean that preachers will not preach to these people, but that these people will not go to hear the preacher. You build commodious places; you procure popular preachers; you establish district societies, and town missions, and Christian instruction societies and schools;—and very many of these truly evangelical ministrations come in aid of the pastoral functions, and bring here and there a family to your public worship. Still the cold and stern truth is,—the preacher of the modern pulpit preaches to but a scantling of the modern people!

The remedy for this state of things, we are persuaded, must be as multiform as the causes which have produced it. There is much to be done beyond what is conventionally understood to be the legitimate range of the pulpit. Let the government look well to its duty in this matter. Let our legislators look to theirs. Let the British people look to theirs. Let all the powers of domestic and social life be healthily and vigorously worked; and we will say—let all the preachers of the kingdom follow the example here set them by one of their own number, bringing the case of the modern pulpit fairly before their congregations, and urging on every hearer the discharge of his respective duty in this great business of the nation.

To the preachers themselves we will take leave to offer such thoughts as have occurred to us in the course of long and anxious consideration, earnestly hoping that by a class of men to whom we are so much indebted, and towards whom it is our happiness to cherish the sincerest love and veneration, they will be seriously laid to heart. It is greatly to be desired, that the modern pulpit should rise to a higher measure of POWER—power of mind, moral power, social power. It is not for us to specify

the numerous examples of what we mean, which are to be found in all the Christian denominations of our country. Our desire is, that these known examples should be studied; that the springs of their power should be understood; that they should be generously emulated; and that they should be multiplied in every place.

We wish the public ministry to grasp the public mind in all its ramifications, so that the pulpit may become everywhere the focus of sacred intelligence and the central point of energetic love. It is a law of society, apart from its artificial arrangements and its factitious notions, that the strongest minds shall rule. That will be a happy day for England when these strongest minds, imbued with ardent piety, are working in the pulpit as well as through the press, and in the secular assemblies of the people.

We are further of opinion with Dr. Vaughan, that it would be well for preachers to form a just estimate of the mental powers of the common people.

'It would seem to be a cardinal error among the great majority of preachers in our time, that they think much too meanly of the popular understanding. It is their manner to judge of the minds of men too much by the standard of a technical education, without keeping sufficiently in view either the sameness or the variety of those natural capabilities which God has bestowed upon men as such. It is little remembered, in consequence, that the slightly educated man in the pew may possibly be possessed of much greater sagacity than the thoroughly educated man in the pulpit. Ministers of religion should not need to be reminded, that the smith at his anvil may have more compass of soul in him than is found in the scholar, however much given to his books. In the case of the one, there may be naturally a robust mental health, such as no amount of artificial means would suffice to confer in the case of the other. Equality in these things is of much wider extent than is commonly supposed. The peer and the mechanic are alike specimens of humanity; and, not unfrequently, all the training in the world would fail of securing to the man of high degree the same habit of intelligent perception which may be existing as so much natural bestowment in the man of low degree. In all time, the toe of one grade has come, in this manner, near upon the heel of another accounted as greatly its betters. But in no time has this rivalry between the children of nature and the children of fortune been so prevalent or so marked, as in the time in which we live.'—pp. 21, 22.

We have little hope of the pulpit gaining its legitimate ascendancy among our people, unless our preachers manifest a judicious and hearty sympathy with the real wants and reasonable wishes of the labouring classes. We are well assured that

such sympathy does now exist to a comparatively large extent; but we dare not affirm that it is universal: we do not know that it can even be said to be at all general. However this may be, it is certain that, among the portion of British society to which we are now referring, there is a strong feeling against the clergy of all persuasions. It is easy enough to say that such a feeling is groundless; that it is the effect of dislike to the truth; that it is a rude jealousy of every sign of superiority. We are not disposed, of course, to defend this feeling. Neither do we regard it as wise, right, or safe, simply to condemn it. We would have our religious teachers, universally, to feel, that, like their Lord, their most appropriate and principal sphere is amongst the living forests of the people; and that the success of their evangelical labours depends on their sympathy with all that is reasonable, and their wise tolerance of much that is *not* reasonable in popular feeling. *We* can afford to despise the hollow cant that would represent us, in so saying, as pandering to the passions of the rabble, and turning the preachers of the gospel into leaders of sedition; and we here most earnestly beseech the pious preachers of the present day to despise it too. Are the people *to be* alienated from your pulpits? Alas, *they have left you!* The question of the day is, *Can* they be brought back? How are they to be brought back? Does it not concern the honour of our Christianity that they should be brought back? Oh! it were a noble triumph of the modern pulpit, to see men of strong principle and self-controlling wisdom gathering round them the most boisterous elements of our social atmosphere, *conducting* the lightnings with which its darkest thunder-clouds are charged, and showing to the nation they have saved that the preaching of the cross is still the '*Power of God.*'—Of course such an enterprise of home evangelization will require that our ministers shall be *men of action.* If we mistake not, the most successful preachers of the day are not those who are merely preachers. We wish it to be understood that the activity required is something more than what, we suppose, is usually understood by pastoral visitation. We have nothing to say against the kind courtesies which the gentler portions of us so much need, and which other portions of us may be said to *exact* from our respective pastors: we think these courtesies have their value. We fancy, however, that all this belongs more to a state of society that is passing away, than to a state of society which is coming on. Whether or not this be anything more than fancy, we really do mean something, which—whether compatible or not with human ability, amid the received expectations of Christian churches—is now wanted to adapt the services of the pulpit to the demands of society at large.

To carry out our views, we acknowledge that the following things must be secured:—ministers, possessing, with all other wise and pious qualities, very great energy; a greater number of such ministers, acting in harmony, in our great towns, and in the larger congregations; and a habit of systematic co-operation with these ministers among all believing men and women.

Some of our readers may be ready to fear that our suggestions border upon harshness, and that we are forgetting that society, at all times and in all its compartments, looks up to the Christian pulpit for those consolatory displays of truth which require devout tenderness rather than force.—We are quite aware, indeed, that in urging special considerations arising from the present state of society, we are in danger of overlooking the religious wants of society in all its states. All that our space admits of saying just at present is, that we are keeping in remembrance the permanent wants of society:—it is because we are concerned that such wants should be met on the largest possible scale that we concentrate our observations on one particular point—the keeping up of the pace of the ministry with the pace of the generation to which we belong.

We have not room to enlarge, as we could wish, on the great importance of connecting the modern pulpit with the literary cultivation of our people, especially those of our people who are engaged in manual labour. There was a time when the laborious peasant might be said to owe all his information, beyond the handicraft by which he earned his bread, to the teaching of his pastor. That time has gone;—we have no wish for its return. The serfdom of the intellect has no more charms for us than the slavery of the limbs.

Even if it were desirable, the altered relations of society have rendered it both unnecessary and impossible. It is not possible, on any large scale; for it should be considered, that a vast augmentation of strictly professional labour has come to devolve on our spiritual guides, not more from the increase of numbers than from the growth of those expectations from the preacher *as* a preacher, which are generated by more widely diffused intelligence. Nor is it necessary that our ministers should, in general, be teachers of any truths besides those of the gospel; for other modes of teaching, and better teachers of secular truth, are multiplied with great rapidity. What then, we may fairly be asked, would you have the preachers of our age to do in this business? We will say plainly what we would have them to do.

First of all,—we would have them to inform themselves, by personal observation and inquiry, of the state of intellect, and of knowledge on points not usually regarded as religious, among the people that surround them. We would have them to be

known as men who feel a real and considerate interest in the *minds* of the community. According to our judgment, the preacher should be always recognised as the enlightened, bold, and steady advocate of the most liberal education that the capacities and leisure of the working classes, and their sons and daughters, will admit of. We would have our preachers take the lead in the councils of those far-seeing and really practical men, who *know* that the dangers of society lie not in the intelligence of the many, but in their ignorance. We would have them to give no quarter to the pampered and unreasoning respectables who fancy that knowledge is a kind of portable gas, to be doled out to the lower orders just in quantities sufficient to show them how to serve their betters; instead of seeing that it is the daylight intended by our Maker for every eye, guiding every man in every step of life and death. We would have the preacher to take into his account the almost unlimited power of the press; and to remember, that if this power is not worked in the way of spreading knowledge, it will be worked in the way of spreading something which is *not* knowledge, and which is worse than ignorance! Then we would have the preacher of our country to foster, in the hearts of labouring men, the feeling of independence which will raise them above considering education as a charity. We have, we confess, a special reason for urging this; because we happen to know, what doubtless all our readers also know, that as churches have been made to obstruct Christianity, so schools, barbarously denominated 'charity schools,' have been used to hinder nearly all that deserves the name of education.—But apart from this, we are well assured that the sober and industrious men who abound, notwithstanding the prevalent intemperance, can afford to pay all that ought to be paid in a well-managed system of instruction; and that the character of the instruction will be more thoroughly tested and more justly prized by those who cheerfully pay for it out of their hard but honourable earnings.

We would urge on the attention of our ministers some important points of consideration in addition to this one respecting schools. The first is, an acquaintance with the *science and practical inventions of general teaching.* We do not now profess any opinion as to the extent in which the preachers of our country are familiar with matters of this nature; but most deeply are we convinced that it will tend greatly to the beneficial influence of the pulpit, to bestow upon them a great degree of their attention.—A second point is, that *our ministers should thoroughly understand the state of the press,* that they should know the kinds and quantities of printed preaching that finds so many pulpits, and sways so many congregations; that they should be

well furnished with catalogues of the best cheap publications on all subjects; and should deserve, and sooner or later they will have, the reputation of being judges to whom men may safely appeal in such matters.—A third point, which we must touch with similar brevity, is, that our ministers should take as much *visible* interest as possible in reading associations, libraries, newspapers, and other periodicals, and in oral lectures by able men, on science, history, political institutions, antiquities, poetry, music, the useful and ornamental arts, amongst the labouring classes of the people. The scope of these recommendations is, we trust, sufficiently apparent. Those ministers who have wisely and patiently acted on them hitherto would smile at our simplicity, were we to utter sanguine predictions of the immediate benefits of such plans of action; yet, convinced as we are that these are things to be desired, we freely express our convictions, and commend them to the judgment of those who have the power, so far as they approve, to carry them into practice. It should be remembered that it is only by carrying such views out to a large extent that they can be vigorous anywhere; but let beginnings be made where they are needed, and the example will be contagious: it will be seen that the modern pulpit is adorned by men who look into the depths of society, and stand prepared to pour into those depths as much as possible of every light of truth.

Returning to the direct bearing of the pulpit on the masses of our people, we must not overlook the need of great attention to the *manner* of addressing them. It is a most unhappy prejudice which associates with addresses to the multitude the idea of inferiority in point of style and elocution. True it is, that men of crude pretensions have set up, sometimes, as the religious teachers of the untaught multitude; and these men have been followed, applauded, and—forgotten. But it is altogether an erroneous opinion that regards the multitude as incapable of appreciating what is better. We will admit that the robust men of England, and the shrewd thinkers of Scotland, and the irreligious of all grades and districts, are little likely to be won by tame dilutions of established creeds, by elegant disquisitions, by dry theological technicalities, by pleasant homilies, by faultless common places, or by loose and declamatory harangues; but we engage to maintain that the best preachers, in every sense, might soon come to be appreciated by the great majority of British minds. We do conceive that manly thought, clearly expressed, may be upheld by arguments which can interest and satisfy the common mind; that images taken from well-known facts, and from familiar scenes, will touch the imagination of the least refined; and that gushes of tenderness, and bursts of unaffected passion, in the pulpit, will reach the hearts of all. The

English crowd must be spoken to in the good old English tongue. Nearly all our words of strength are there. Coarseness, we hardly need to say, is not less disrespectful to the hearers of *any* class, than it is unworthy of religion, and beneath the sacredness of the pulpit. The purest language, the chastest figures, the strongest reasoning, and the noblest elocution, will ever prove the most popular with the many, as they already command the approbation of the few. But above all things, the preacher must be IN EARNEST. We live in an age of earnestness. *Working men especially are really in earnest.* We quote the language of one of the most awakening preachers of our country:—'The power of unaffected, well-displayed earnestness, in the pursuit of any object of life, is manifest; and in the ministry it must ever be a mighty weapon. We have none of us yet tried and wielded it as we ought; if we did, the church and the world would soon present a new aspect, each labourer obtaining the triumphs of Whitfield and Paul. My dear sir, cherish it as your very life. It will be as a spell upon the minds with which you come in contact; and if there be beyond its circle those who count you enthusiastic, and perhaps 'mad,' as they did the apostle before you, receive the imputation as a compliment to your character, for which you have reason to be grateful; determine, if this is to be vile, that you will be yet more vile still; and let your unmoved conviction go forth, that the man who could contemplate the facts which have inspired you, without exerting every nerve, faculty, and passion here, possesses not a principle but what religion and benevolence must blush to own, and even depravity itself refuse and disdain to record, except in the darkest catalogue of its crimes.'*

For the reason already stated, we shall not now dwell on the other classes of society, but strongly recommend to our readers the well-formed and admirably expressed views of Dr. Vaughan.

The changes which have taken place in the middle classes, are such as to have given them an extent of knowledge, and what is more important, a disciplined and scrutinising habit of mind, which places the modern preacher in a new and, perhaps, somewhat difficult position. The leaders of the Church of England, we see, disparage preaching in comparison with the offices and sacraments provided for in the liturgy, and there may be *personal* as well as ecclesiastical and theological reasons for their so doing; but it is certainly a fact that the number of able and popular preachers in that establishment has greatly increased. The Congregationalists embracing those on both sides of the question of baptism, and the Wesleyan Methodists of the present day, have

* Charge to the Rev. R. C. Pritchett, Darlington, by the Rev. James Parsons. 1841.

their main strength among the middle classes: from which it would seem only natural to infer, that on the whole, the preaching in these denominations, at any rate, is adapted to this large and important class. It is certain that what adaptation it has, it has in relation to the middle classes of society. As it is, however, Dr. Vaughan plainly conveys his impression that among ourselves the state of the pulpit is open to much, very much of the complaint, which we regard as applicable to it elsewhere.

'If deficiency in pulpit ability, in certain respects, is not so manifest among us as in the established church, it is mainly because our system is of a nature to be always placing such evils in process of correcting themselves. Our preaching may not consist in reading the smooth pointless essay, but it may not be on this account the less barren of instructive thought, and impressive utterance. It may be much in advance of the preaching which is tolerated, and even praised, in the case of the feebler portion of the evangelical clergy, and still be so far below its proper level, as to be of small effect and very little valued. Extemporaneous discourses may partake largely of the faults of that manner of preaching, and very little of its excellences. The consciousness of possessing thought, may be allowed to induce a negligence of utterance; or, a consciousness of possessing utterance may be allowed to induce a negligence of thought. In the former case, we lose our hold on the less intelligent; in the latter, on the more intelligent, by whom the less are generally governed.

'It is a sore trial of patience to hear some preachers talk of the inability of their hearers to appreciate good sermons, as the reason why they do not labour to produce such sermons. It would often be well for the preacher, in such cases, did he possess half the capacity of not a few of the minds which he has learned to despise. Good sermons are discourses adapted to edification, and my experience has never brought me in the way of a middle class auditory that could not at once appreciate a sermon characterized by that kind of goodness, always supposing it to be delivered with a good natural manner.

'It is to errors of this description—errors of a nature which it would seem most natural in men of sense to avoid—that we must look for an explanation of the fact, that the instances in which our own pulpits are occupied in a manner so little suited to the times in which we live are so numerous as we find them. It is painful when even the preaching of the gospel comes to be a matter *borne* with, rather than a matter highly esteemed and valued. But so it is at present to a grievous extent, and so it must be whenever disparity is felt to be on the side of the teacher rather than the taught.'—pp. 43,44.

The chapter on the higher classes is written with great success. The prevalence of intellectual culture, science, skill, taste, and imagination among these classes is set forth in a style which implies rather than ostentatiously displays how familiar the writer is with them, and how easily his own preaching may be supposed

to be such as the most cultivated amongst them will most highly appreciate. He maintains that the pulpit must be our grand instrument for counteracting the numberless appliances by which religious delusion is enslaving the imagination of the educated; he demonstrates the necessity of exhibiting the truth in company with all its congenial attractions; and he shews, from the example of the Divine Preacher, from the grandeur of the themes of our religion, from the plenteousness and variety of natural imagery, and from the history of the Christian pulpit in its best efforts, that the simplest forms of worship *may be so conducted* as to interest the imagination more deeply and more permanently than the most elaborate displays of art.

'If it has been the manner of Antichrist to cluster upon the simple institutes of the gospel an endless trumpery devised by man, be it ours to bring to them those better adornments which their Divine Author has furnished to us in his own works, and which our blessed Lord himself has thus appropriated through the whole course of his recorded ministry. The great demand now made on Christians in this respect is, that what other men aim to do by scenic show from the altar, should be done, and much better done, in our case, by effective instruction from the pulpit, and that on the whole matter of visible aids in religion, we should spare no pains in opposing to every illusive spectacle supplied by art, the truthful utterances which may be always successfully invoked from the real magnificence of nature.

'But the power necessary to this kind of preaching, while it must come in part from nature, must come also from much study, and from a devout solicitude to lead men into paths of truth and piety. Nor is anything further from our thoughts in the above observations, than to encourage that kind of preaching, which in its exuberance of language and allusion, seems not to belong either to poetry or prose. Sermons in general, are addresses to the people, and, as such, should be eminently popular; in some connexions, a certain measure of homeliness would be their great excellence. But men do not need to be unnatural in making use of nature. Our example in this respect is before us in His manner, who preached on the sower that went forth to sow—on the blade and the ear, and the full corn in the ear—and on the man who built his house upon the rock, and the other who built upon the sand.'—pp. 64, 65.

We have read Dr. Vaughan's 'Review of the Pulpit in relation to the Past,' with much interest.

Latimer and the Reformers, Baxter and the Puritans, rise as it were from the dead, and show us how they preached. We seem to hear the luxurious and poetical and learned eloquence of Taylor, overwhelming the preacher even more than it enchants the audience. We listen to Barrow, exhausting every theme and our patience too. We recoil from the indevout orthodoxy of South, while our laughter at his drolleries, and our ad-

miration of his power, are checked by the bitterness of his sarcasm and the bigotry of his derision. Further on, we behold the grave and profound Owen, listening with amazement, almost with envy, to 'the tinker,' who delights all ages in all nations with his Pilgrim. And then the masters of the English pulpit pass before us in long procession, whilst each is heard to tell, in brief but vivid terms, the story of his time. Dr. Vaughan's estimate of the individual character of these preachers, and the manner in which he connects them with the events and the spirit of their respective periods, are worthy of his reputation; and they will suggest to his ministerial readers, in particular, such thoughts as cannot but work beneficially for us all.

We must omit all remark on the preachers of other nations. Dr. Vaughan has referred to them with caution, and we may add, with delicate impartiality. He sums up his retrospect and his comparison in these emphatic words:—

'Our idea with regard to what preaching ought to be, must not be derived from what now obtains elsewhere, but from what is before us in the example of inspired men, and from what is demanded by the age in which we live. In the preaching of reformers and puritans, and in that of episcopalians, nonconformists, and methodists, much may be observed from which we shall do well to learn, but much must be added to what may be so learned, and added purely from our own studious and devout consideration.'—p. 143.

Passing by the salutary counsels of this volume with respect to a self-educated ministry, and the admirable chapter on a good pulpit elocution, which applies to reading and to prayer not less than to preaching, and also the brief—too brief—but beautiful chapters on Divine Influence and on Ministerial Piety, we must conclude what we have to say by directing our readers to the practical question which this treatise, as a whole, is so well fitted to press home to every mind:—

What can be done to make the modern pulpit all that it ought to be—all that it might be—all that it *must* be, if it is to retain its hold on the British mind and conscience?

We would entreat the ministers whose devotion and ability give just weight to all their proceedings, to take this great question with them to their secret chambers; to discuss it in their conferences with one another; and to bring their matured and practical views of it before the people at large. We have intimated already our belief that it has engaged much of their thought. The time seems to have come when no man can be a minister in this country, without having this question daily brought before him, not simply as a personal affair, but as an affair of public concern. It is most manifest, however, that this is not merely a question for men engaged in the onerous duties

of the pulpit. It is a question for us all:—'The Protestant pulpit,' Dr. Vaughan plainly and truly tells us, 'in the future will be found to possess the required efficiency only as our laity shall be resolved on seeing that it does possess it.'

Is it not a fact which cannot be concealed, that the removal of a pastor, by death or by other changes, is a season of the greatest anxiety and danger; and that the anxiety and the danger are often the greatest in those churches in which from local circumstances the efficiency of the pulpit is felt to be the most essential?

Is it not a fact, too, that for many years past, amongst Protestant dissenters, generally, the members of families who can command the greatest advantages of education are not trained up in those principles which their fathers prized; and that a much smaller portion than in former times of the well-educated among those who have been trained up in those principles, are encouraged to devote themselves to the labours and honours of the Christian pulpit?

Is it not a fact, too, that instances are too numerous in which the wealthy and the influential, among Protestant dissenters, adopt a manner towards their ministers to which men of refinement, genius, and character will not submit, because they know it to be wrong in principle, as well as hurtful to their feelings and to their usefulness? And is it not a fact, that ministers of religion are exposed to the rudeness and vulgarity which are not more repugnant to good manners, and disgusting to good taste, than they are inconsistent with the spirit of the gospel and with the interests of Christian liberty?

We hail with sanguine delight the beginnings of a sounder state of feeling in the dissenting communities towards the institutions in which our ministers are to be trained. The conductors of these institutions, we have been informed in answer to our inquiries, are directing their most assiduous consideration to all practicable methods of increasing their efficiency to meet the rising demands of modern society. We have expounded our views on these points in some former articles of this Review, and we have reason to know that our humble labours in this department have not been without fruit. But the duty of *the entire religious community* in connexion with ministerial education, demands our separate and earnest attention; and we shall bring it before our readers with all the strength and plainness we can command.

Art. V. *Memoirs of the Life of the Rev. Lant Carpenter, LL.D., with Selections from his Correspondence.* Edited by his Son, Russell Lant Carpenter, B.A. pp. 516. London: Green, Newgate-street.

One of the greatest evils of controversy, as it has been generally conducted, is its *personal* character. An immense amount of time and talent has been spent on what, after all, has had nothing to do with the points in dispute. What relevancy to the truth or falsehood of a sentiment has the kindness or malevolence, the honesty or unfairness, the wisdom or folly of its advocate? Had truth been pursued by all, as a reality, apart from the personal qualities of its professed advocates, had men and their works been regarded as only so many means, well or ill adapted to the purpose, of aiding its investigation, not only would polemical literature have been free from a vast multitude of the blemishes which disfigure it, but the truth itself would have been more clearly perceived and more fully developed. The state of mind which personal controversy exhibits and induces, and especially the kind of personal controversy of which the world has seen so much, affords but little hope of success in this sacred and solemn enterprise. It is composed of the activity of passions, whose quiescence is necessary, whose agitation is fatal, to the prosperous issue of such pursuits, if indeed there can be said to be any pursuit of truth at all while those passions are inflamed. It is the calm and pure soul that has the promise of spiritual revelations. God shows his 'way' to the 'meek.' Still and unpolluted are the waters that best reflect the beauteous images of earth and heaven.

And while the pursuit of truth, which should be the only object of all polemics, and is of all good and holy ones, is impeded by the practice of mingling what is personal to the combatants with what is common to the theme, a most important injustice is done to the highest truth thereby. The evil features of human character are dwelt upon and exposed, greatly to the injury of the good features, and a desire is cherished of finding in opponents faults rather than excellences. This is incident to all controversy, the tendency to think unfavourably of men, simply on the ground of their differing from us in opinion, being natural and strong, and requiring not encouragement, but suppression.

On these accounts we esteem it most important that the *private lives* of men who have occupied a prominent polemical position should be made known, especially if it have been held in connexion with the more weighty and influential controversies. Nothing tends so much to abate the angry feelings,

and to lessen the distance which controversy occasions, to bring men of various sentiments together, and to diffuse among them a healthy feeling of respect and charity, as the revelation of the inward life and private manners of those who have done public battle for their faith. It preserves and promotes a recognition of the rights of humanity, apart from all theological debate; it keeps up and cherishes the feelings of men as such, which are in danger of being weakened and perverted by their intercourse and collision as polemics; and serves often to beget and increase moral esteem for those whose more notorious exhibitions did not tend, as controversies seldom do, to present their moral excellences in the most attractive light. We thus behold men in circumstances to excite a fraternal sympathy, we see them exposed to all the common and familiar toils and travels of our mortal life, subjects of sorrow, disappointment, pain, and death, and we behold them, too, expressing, in various ways, and ways not open to the least suspicion of design or hypocrisy, the sentiments of a sound morality and pure devotion. We see them cherishing the dispositions of a free and sincere religiousness, and reciprocating the generosities of social fellowship. We thus learn to make amends through the moral, for the wrong often done by us through the technical, of the human heart; while we retain, it may be, all the articles of our theological creed unmodified, we are taught not to do despite to the great religious conscience of mankind, and we recognise and reverence the superiority of secret intercourse with God, and the rectitude and benevolence of social life to the mere wordy symbols and creeds of men.

For these and other reasons, we are glad that the life of Dr. Carpenter has appeared. We do not affect indifference to the points in relation to which the denomination to which he belonged differs from what, in our view, is apostolical Christianity. The reality and magnitude of those points, as entering into the very vitalities of Christian truth and human godliness, this review has ever maintained, though by 'speaking the truth in love' it has sometimes excited the suspicions of some who cannot think a man in earnest unless he be in a rage, nor give him credit for loving the truth if he do not hate heretics. Nevertheless we do rejoice, and express our joy, that while the public and polemical labours of Dr. Carpenter are likely to be the subjects of extensive notice and investigation from his fellow men, they are now enabled to take a nearer and better view of him in other and more interesting and amiable capacities, 'fulfilling' his private and individual 'course,' and discharging the functions of home and friendship. Such a life as his deserved to be written, such a character demanded exhibition, and it is pity that his

theological repute and ecclesiastical position should prevent, as they will do, multitudes reading the one and beholding the other, who might greatly profit by both.

The memoirs of Dr. Carpenter are written by his son, Russell Lant Carpenter, and they do him honour. With the exception of some applications, or rather misapplications, of Scripture language to his father, which savour of more than bad taste, and some faults incident to inexperienced authorship, we can give it conscientious praise. It is written without any ambitious attempts at fine writing or display of any kind, and we have not discovered a single sentiment or sentence, though the author belongs to a denomination held in special theological abhorrence by other sects, at which those sects could take legitimate objection or a sound offence. It is no small advantage to the 'Memoirs,' that they are composed by the *son* of their subject. In such a circumstance there is no necessary cause of partiality or unfairness, while there are some men, and Dr. Carpenter was one of them, who cannot be understood nor appreciated but by those that love them, and that possess the knowledge which the intimacies of family connexion alone afford. The editor has made great use of Dr. Carpenter's papers and letters, and has thus given us a fuller insight into his heart than we could have otherwise obtained.

Lant Carpenter was born at Kidderminster, September 2nd, 1780, of parents connected with families long respectable among the nonconformists of Worcestershire and Warwickshire. In childhood he displayed the activity and fearlessness which afterwards so strongly marked his character, and one instance is mentioned of a narrow escape from death through them. One Sunday morning, when about three years old, he was throwing stones into the river which ran close by his father's house from the 'water-lid,' when he was precipitated by his ardour and energy into the water, from which he was providentially rescued by a domestic. His father failing in his business, and leaving Kidderminster, Lant was adopted by Mr. Pearsall, a sensible and benevolent man, and a relative of his mother, who, among other proofs of his intelligence and charity, 'established a Sunday-school upon his own estate, about the same time that Mr. Raikes began one at Gloucester, and without knowing that the idea had occurred to any one else.' Mr. Pearsall belonged to a congregation which seceded from that which had been under the care of the well-known Rev. B. Fawcett. The cause of this secession is stated to have been the 'highly calvinistic' sentiments of his successor. The following interesting circumstance is told of young Carpenter while with Mr. Pearsall:—

'While yet a boy, Dr. Carpenter aided his paternal friend in teaching the Sunday scholars; and it subsequently occurred to him, probably when about the age of eleven, that some plan might be devised for giving them more extended instruction during the week. A difficulty, however, presented itself; these boys were accustomed to begin their daily labour at five o'clock in the morning, and to continue it till late in the evening; but this did not deter either him or them. At four o'clock they awoke him, both in winter and summer; and in the summer under a mulberry tree, at other times in a little summer-house without fire, they received from him their hour's instruction in writing, arithmetic, and other branches of useful knowledge. We believe that all these youths grew up to be useful members of society. In one instance, at least, a great and lasting benefit was conferred; aided by the education thus imparted, one of his scholars advanced himself to a very respectable station, and died, a little before his early friend, an alderman in his native town; always most gratefully acknowledging the obligations under which he lay to the kind instructor of his boyhood.'—pp. 10, 11.

A strong influence was exerted upon his mind by Mr. Pearsall. From him he imbibed his Unitarian principles, by him his talents were cultivated to a considerable extent, and from his character and counsels the moral excellences of his after life received a powerful impulse. His elder brother thus describes him:—'In early life he was the type of what he was in after life,—good, amiable, kind, always trying to please and to make others happy (and he always succeeded), exerting his energies in instructing the ignorant, and, as far as in him lay, in reforming the wicked; in fact, as far as he had the power, in adding to the virtue and happiness of the world. During the whole of his early years, as you all know, he did not live with his family; and his occasional visits were always hailed with joy, by the whole of us—certainly enthusiastically so by myself.' Mr. Pearsall, in his adoption, contemplated his future entrance into the Christian ministry, and consequently at the age of thirteen, sent him to the house of his uncle, the Rev. B. Carpenter, of Stourbridge. Here he remained two years, at the end of which he returned to Kidderminster, where, for two more years, he was placed under the superintendence of the Rev. W. Blake, who presided over a school established and endowed by Mr. Pearsall. At this time he commenced a library in connexion with the Sunday schools, (then quite a novelty) for the purpose of providing books for the lower classes, and to be open to all denominations. This scheme, the early opposition to which he surmounted by his skill, succeeded, and the institution remains to this day. At the age of seventeen, he went to the Dissenting Academy at Northampton,

which it is not necessary to inform our readers had sadly departed from the evangelical principles upon which it was established under the celebrated Dr. Doddridge. The tutor at this time was the Rev. John Horsey, a man of orthodox views, though 'liberal,' to use the pet word of these times, but the students were for the most part Unitarian in their belief. 'We have,' wrote Mr. Carpenter, 'no regular tutor except Mr. Horsey; Mr. Ross takes the mathematical part, and Mr. Case, the senior student, the classical: we shall have a classical tutor from Scotland by the twenty-second of this month; the trustees do not seem to wish to get a mathematical tutor, for fear, I suppose, they should teach the students sufficient to make schoolmasters of them. I have at present but seven lectures a-week, two in pneumatology, two in the classics, and three in algebra; but I suppose we shall have more in the classics when the tutor comes. * * * There are but twelve students, but we expect three or four more after Christmas.' Not long after, the academy was dissolved, and the students were scattered, some of them entering at Manchester College, and others the University of Glasgow. Of this last number was Mr. Carpenter, who 'having passed a creditable introductory examination, entered with earnestness and pleasure upon his new and much more varied course of study; his exertions, however, were early checked by a very severe attack of rheumatic fever, which, from Nov. 19th, precluded him for twelve weeks from attendance on the college classes, and more or less impeded his progress through the whole of the session. It was the impression among his fellow-students, before his illness, that he would have obtained the first prize; but his absence from lectures, of course, completely 'put him out of the competition.' He succeeded, however, beyond his hopes; as a class prize in mathematics, and the fifth prize in logic were awarded him.' His illness, which was severe, seems to have been attended with deep impressions on the subject of religion, and one of its fruits was a sense of the value of a surer basis than he had yet known. Accordingly he devoted the vacation to an earnest investigation of the Evidences of Divine Revelation, which terminated in 'a deep and unwavering conviction of its truth.' In 1801 he entered upon an examination of the doctrine of the Trinity, and we doubt not our readers will be interested in his own account of it:—

'When your letter (he writes to a friend) arrived, I had lately begun the exercise which was given out in the common-hall (by Dr. Findlay, the Divinity Professor), 'The View of the Socinian Controversy.' I undertook it principally in order to give me a motive to review it, and also to look over the Trinitarian arguments, with which I was not much acquainted. The prize, which is only a silver medal,

is undoubtedly not worth the trouble, even if I should succeed; but I think it will be very useful to me in other points of view; and the liberality of some of the Trinitarians, and the greater weight of argument they have to adduce on their side the question than I expected, will, I hope, give me a larger portion of candour when I finish it, than when I began it. I am by no means nearer being a Trinitarian than I ever was; and, indeed, rather the contrary; but I perceive that, if I had been bred up in Trinitarian principles, I should have seen so much to favour this mode of faith, and such a delightful shelter in the incomprehensibility of the doctrines, that I will not say that I should easily have got rid of them. I used to think the belief in the Trinity a mere prejudice; now I think that, though very much must be attributed to prejudice, to induce a man to hold that doctrine, there is something in Scripture to countenance the opinion of a man who brings it with him; though to me there appears in almost every page sufficient to overturn it. They have, however, such a dexterous method of satisfying their own minds, by the doctrine of the two natures, that the texts which assert the humanity of Christ and his inferiority to the Father, do not in the least touch them; and they have such high ideas of the impossibility of understanding the modus of the Trinity, and of the inexplicable nature of the union which subsists between the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit,—that, though Cooper has, in my estimation, given a decided blow on rational principles to every explanation which deserves the name of Trinitarian, they all think that it has nothing to do with their particular mode of belief. I know that those who believe the doctrine of the Trinity would shudder at the idea of Tritheism; and yet I acknowledge I cannot see any medium between Tritheism and the personal unity of the Deity.' * * * 'I feel I am in the fair road to the simple humanity; but I am in no inclination to gallop on too fast. I am well satisfied that I shall always venerate the character of our Saviour; and I think I see reason to be satisfied, that, if I act as becometh his disciple,—if I endeavour to imitate his example, and exercise those means of doing good which may be in my power, I shall meet with his approbation when I appear before his tribunal. As to the doctrine of the atonement, I have no idea of it whatever in the sense of a satisfaction, expiation, &c.; but I own myself at a loss to find out to my satisfaction any notions of the peculiar benefit of the death of Christ, which shall suit the Scripture language.' * * * 'I have read Priestly 'on the Miraculous Conception,' and Williams 'on the First and Second Chapters of Matthew;' but I cannot get over the genuineness of those of Luke; and, if I admit the genuineness of them, I believe I shall not be able to get over the authenticity of the miraculous conception. If it be false, I should be glad to get rid of it, for it certainly is a considerable stumbling block, and attended with great difficulties; but, if it be true, it avails nothing in the Trinitarian argument, and the difficulties are not sufficient to weigh one single grain, in *my* estimation, to the prejudice of Christianity.'—pp. 55—59.

We have given this long extract, because it not only furnishes Mr. Carpenter's own history of a most important exercise of his mind, but affords matter for much general remark. Of course 'very much of the belief in the Trinity must be attributed to prejudice,' and the man who has it does not altogether escape from the suspicion of 'bringing it with him' to the Bible, but it is pleasant to find that the Scriptures do afford a show of evidence in support of that belief. We cannot but imagine that many who regard it, as Mr. Carpenter once did, as 'a mere prejudice,' would at least modify, if they did not altogether abandon, their views, on 'looking over the Trinitarian arguments, with which' (like himself) they are not 'much acquainted.' But there is another thing to be noticed here. Mr. Carpenter, while ascribing a large measure of Trinitarian faith to prejudice, seems unaware of the possibility of being influenced by that state of mind himself, and yet we cannot conceal our strong and painful impression, that it, or something like it, is indicated in the very passage we have given. That the 'rational' difficulties of Trinitarianism swayed him much, that he was alarmed by the danger of Tritheism, is of small account. The whole narrative presents before our minds a man inquiring into the grounds of a belief to which he was powerfully indisposed, and whose indisposition must have 'influenced his perceptions.' He confesses to have come to the investigation 'not much acquainted with Trinitarian arguments,' and he speaks of 'getting over,' and 'getting rid of' things, in a way which, in our opinion, is not at all consistent in a professed inquirer after truth, and truth relating to such deep and momentous subjects as were under his consideration.

We must express our unaffected lamentation over the grounds upon which he seems to have placed his hopes of eternal life. 'I think I see reason to be satisfied, that, if I act as becometh his disciple, if I endeavour to imitate his example, and exercise those means of doing good which may be in my power, I shall meet with his approbation when I appear before his tribunal.' A sentiment, in letter and spirit, so alien from the teachings of revelation respecting the hope of sinners, must be deeply deplored by all who do not cherish the same opinions with himself. It is a cause for sincere grief, that 'while at a loss to find out to his satisfaction any notions of the peculiar benefit of the death of Christ, which shall suit the Scripture language,' he should trust to 'a virtuous character' to 'secure him happiness in a future state.'

Mr. Carpenter left Glasgow, and became assistant to the Rev. J. Corrie, at Birch's Green, near Birmingham, in 1801. In the following year he became one of the librarians of the Athenæum at Liverpool, where he remained, partly engaged in the work

of tuition, and occasionally preaching, till the end of 1804, when he visited Exeter as a candidate for the Unitarian pulpit there. The congregation invited him to become their assistant pastor, and in March of the following year, he left Liverpool to settle at Exeter, where his hopes, which had been long delayed, were fulfilled in his marriage with a 'help-meet' every way worthy of his preference. In the next year, anticipating his occasional appearance as an author, he sought to obtain the degree of M.A., when his inquiry whether the degree could be conferred without personal attendance, was answered by the following gratifying and amusing letter from Professor Young:—

'*Glasgow College, 28th November*, 1806.

'My dear Sir,—It is with great satisfaction that I announce to you the determination of our Senatus, *not* to grant the degree of A.M. which you wish them to confer on you in absence. There is no instance, in late times at least, of the degree in arts being so granted among us; and although, in mentioning the matter, I stated the respectful and modest manner in which your desire was expressed, and reminded the members of your brilliant curriculum which they all had, indeed (without my μνησις), fully in their view, yet they remained inflexible, I myself scarcely expressing a wish for the '*Speciali Gratiâ*' deviation. This determination, therefore, it is my business to announce; and it is with very great satisfaction I announce it.' (Here the first page of the letter terminates.)

'"Satisfaction?" "Yes, *Doctor*, 'twas my word.' Listen. In expressing their regret that they could not consistently confer on you, in absence, the degree of Master of Arts, it was hinted that, without violating any precedent, the *greater* degree of LL.D. might be conferred on you in absence; and to this expedient they all agreed without one dissenting voice. So here you are, in our mind's eye, the Rev. Lant Carpenter, LL.D.; and it is for the said Rev. Lant Carpenter to consider whether this title is not as *pretty* as the other, and whether it will not *look* as pretty on the title-page of any book or books coming forth, or to come forth, under his name.

'As you are a dissenter, you will consider the *nolo episcopari* as an unnecessary and affected form, and close at once with the good intention of your friends, throwing around you the doctorial vestments which we reach out to you, *con amore*, and which you will not sully nor stain. So say I, and so say we all.

'As this degree is not *asked*, but conferred, '*mero*,' or '*proprio motu*,' as we say (N.B. *Mero* is *not* from *merum, vinum*), it is not charged with the usual expenses of such a degree (which are high), nor with any expenses other than those smaller dues which attend the extension of the diploma. Of these take no thought. They can be easily settled for you by any of your friends here.

'"I am too young to be a doctor." You must allow us to judge of that. Besides, it is not the *aged* degree that we confer on you, but

that which, in the civil law, corresponds to that of barrister in the municipal, which is often taken at one-and-twenty: *you* are *more*.

'Write me soon, and the steps for completing this inchoate business will be taken immediately.

'I write in haste, and only thank you at present in a summary manner, being, with great regard,

'My dear Sir, yours very truly,

'Jo. Young.'

During his residence in Exeter, Dr. Carpenter was obliged, by ill health, to suspend his pastoral labours, during which time, however, he was busily employed in the establishment of a public library, whose management he held alone for some time, and a work on whose objects and benefits he published. This library remains in a flourishing condition. Upon the appearance of the 'Improved Version,' he wrote a searching review of it in the Monthly Repository, marked by great learning and candour, from which his opponents have often derived their facts and arguments without saying so. In 1813, the introduction of a bill favouring Catholics became the occasion of his showing himself decidedly and zealously in behalf of the removal of the disabilities under which that people laboured. He was several times engaged in controversy while in Exeter, not always with the mild and courteous, and devoted himself to several literary works, besides obeying, with promptitude and zeal, every call of humanity and public duty. In 1817 he became the successor of Dr. Estlin, at Lewin's Mead, Bristol, where he remained till his death, in 1840. It was a singular circumstance that the writer of the letter of invitation to him, in which it was intimated that he would be required sometimes to assume the character of a polemic, should be his first opponent. Dr. Stock, who had drawn up that address, within three months renounced Unitarianism—a conversion which excited no small stir in Bristol, being the occasion of considerable controversy, in which Dr. Carpenter took part. Our space does not allow of a detailed account of his labours and experiences at Bristol. Suffice it to say, that he was very useful in establishing and invigorating many institutions, literary and benevolent and religious, some of them not in immediate connexion with his own congregation, and that he greatly increased the public and private esteem in which he was held, by his uniform propriety of deportment and kindliness of disposition. He was for a considerable period disqualified for his ministerial duties by most distressing mental and bodily debility; but with that exception, there was little interruption to his course of pastoral labour.

His friends had perceived him, for some time, to be easily wearied, before the month of June, 1839, when he was so se-

riously attacked as to make it evidently impossible for him to think of a speedy resumption of his labours. He visited, with a view to relief, some of the watering places on the Bristol Channel, but in vain, upon which, he went to London for medical advice. His physicians there counselled a continental tour, and on the 18th of August, he left London for Antwerp, accompanied by his sister, who returned after a few days, and by Mr. Freeman, a medical gentleman, who had agreed to attend him. They travelled about from place to place, until they reached Naples, on the 6th of March, 1840, from which time to his death we shall quote the account of him given in his memoirs:—

'During the first few days of his residence there, the weather was fair, he was enabled to examine the peculiarities of the city and neighbourhood, and his health appeared improved; but he subsequently suffered from confinement to the house, occasioned by a long continuance of rainy weather. His depression was increased by reading an unfair critique on his Harmony, which had been copied into the 'Standard,' from the 'Bristol Journal.' Political animosity against the ministers led an individual to revive against them the charge which had been made a year and a half before, that they had advised the queen to sanction the publication of a sectarian work: to support his accusation he selected, in a bitter and carping spirit, those passages in which he thought that Dr. Carpenter had shown a Unitarian bias. Charity leads one to hope that the writer was not aware that the object of his attack was an invalid, and travelling abroad. Dr. Carpenter's medical attendant expressed himself in strong terms with respect to the injurious effect of this critique on his mind, regarding it as calculated materially to retard his cure.

'After a residence of nearly a month at Naples, during the latter part of which he was not as well as he had before been, it was determined to proceed to Turin; and, to avoid the wearisome repetition of the same route, they embarked for Leghorn, on board the 'Sully,' a French steamer, bound to Marseilles, which left the harbour about four o'clock on the afternoon of Sunday, the 5th of April. It was thought that if the weather had been fair, he might have been refreshed by his voyage, but, unfortunately, the sea was rough, and the rain prevented him from remaining much on deck. At six o'clock he dined, and had not at that time complained of sickness, though he was evidently uncomfortable. Former experience proved that he was easily disturbed, especially when in delicate health, by the motion of a vessel, and he was always peculiarly dependent on free ventilation. His friend, soon after his meal, was attacked by sea-sickness, and was compelled to lie down. Dr. Carpenter was at that time sitting in the cabin, not far from his bed, in company with three or four other gentlemen, who afterwards retired. He was seen walking on the deck till about eleven o'clock that night, and was subsequently observed standing on the cabin stairs, apparently for the sake of fresh air, the rain being then too violent to allow of any one remaining above. This

was the last time that he was seen, but it appeared the next morning that he had retired to his berth, and had unlocked his bag, and removed some of the contents, as if preparing to go to rest. It is probable that, whilst thus engaged, sea-sickness overpowered him, and that he went on deck, 'when it pleased God suddenly to remove him, in a manner which there was no human eye to witness, and of which no human tongue, therefore, can confidently speak.' That he should not have been observed is the less surprising, as the night was very dark and stormy, and there were only two men upon deck; the vessel was violently tossed, so that one of the paddles was occasionally out of the water; and probably one of these lurches occurring when he was leaning over the side, oppressed by sea-sickness, he lost his balance and fell overboard.

'As soon as his absence was noticed the next morning, the most anxious search was made, but nothing beyond the facts already stated could be ascertained. If any doubt had been entertained as to his death, all uncertainty was removed by the discovery of the body, about two months afterwards, on the coast near Porto d'Anzio, a small sea-port about fifty miles S.S.E. of Rome. In obedience to the sanatory laws of the country, the remains were interred on the sea-shore, and covered with lime. His watch, purse, and pocket-book were restored to his family, through the English consul.'—pp. 439—442.

Thus melancholy were the circumstances of his death. Away from his country and his kindred, ill and low, he was swept away alone, and without warning, amid the silence of the night, from the land of the living. There is something intensely touching about such a decease. But in what fine contrast does it present the material and spiritual of man. The poor frame is by the sudden motion of the ship, and the action of a few waves, consigned to death, and removed from the presence and cognizance of its fellow forms; it is lost to the place that knew it, and to the society in which it moved, unknown and unnoticed; it is put away as a common and unworthy thing; and thus closes an earthly history of no common labours, nor common graces. But *the man* remains; the memory and influence of his character, the works to which he gave the vigour of his days, the ideas and impressions he communicated to the various subjects of his charge, all these remain to operate for evil or for good, and even to acquire fresh force from the accident that has suspended the functions of that corporeal mechanism, to which, as to an instrument, they are to be ascribed. A man's life is longer than his physical existence—is eternal; and Lant Carpenter still lives, not only in the state of separate spirits, where we do not doubt that he retains his consciousness and powers, but below and among men, proving how glorious, amid the poor feebleness of the flesh, are the prerogatives of mind. May the use of our mortal bodies be regulated by a profound respect to that immortal influence which,

through them, we cannot fail to shed upon the universe of God.

We shall not attempt to sketch the character of Dr. Carpenter, although strongly inclined to do so, referring our readers to the 'Memoirs' for the fullest manifestation of his principles and dispositions. Dr. Carpenter frequently appeared before the public as an author, many of his works being of a most useful and important nature. As a polemic, his productions were far more numerous than the natural character of his mind would lead us to expect. Though differing from him on the most momentous subjects on which he wrote as a controversialist, we accept the testimony of his son, that he was more anxious to promote a love of truth than his own particular opinions. He was certainly free from many of the things that but too frequently disgrace and disfigure theological combatants. For patient perseverance, clear thought, and honesty and mildness, there are but few superior to him. His style was generally more or less loose and awkward—a circumstance rather remarkable, when his constant habit of writing his sermons, and his great practice as an author are remembered. His principal controversial work was his reply to Magee. The learned bishop's book on the Atonement, containing an immense amount of valuable matter, was in some respects one of the most singular, and in others one of the most sorrowful works ever published. As a defence of the Atonement, the learning and mental vigour of its author make it worthy of a high place in the theological literature of our country, a place which it has obtained and is likely to keep, but its worth is greatly diminished by its ill arrangement, and especially by its exhibition of a most evil spirit, and all the petty and dishonest arts of controversy. We never met with a work (gladly would we, if possible, use another language) containing more 'opprobrious invectives, and disgraceful misrepresentations.'* If Dr. Magee was not one of those whom Hallam describes as 'accustomed to consider veracity and candour, when they weaken an argument, in the light of treason against the cause,' he was hurried on by an ill-regulated zeal, or an unsanctified passion, to the employment

* This book has supplied innumerable authors with the weapons of their warfare, whose use has only secured their discomfiture and shame. Magee is no safe guide, in reference either to the opinions or language of his opponents. As a striking instance of the danger of using him, we may give the following:—In Dr. Wardlaw's 'Discourses on the Socinian Controversy' (Fourth Edition), pp. 22, 23, there is a professed quotation from Dr. Priestley, acknowledged to have been obtained from Dr. Magee. Part of this passage, though said to be in the language of Dr. Priestley, is only Dr. Magee's representation of it, and the whole is given as one continued quotation, whereas, 'between parts separated only by a colon, there is more than a page of connected argument.'

of methods which nothing can justify or excuse. Dr. Carpenter's temper and spirit are a striking contrast to those of his antagonist, forming one of but too many instances in which the heretic has had the advantage of the orthodox. 'My previous impressions of his amiable and upright character' (says Dr. J. Pye Smith, in his 'Scripture Testimony,' vol. III., p. 433) 'have been strengthened by the perusal of his work. His candour, integrity, and good temper, besides his intellectual ability, give to his writings an immense advantage over the imbecile arrogance, the rash crudities, and the still more dishonourable artifices of some persons on whom he has felt himself called upon to animadvert.' He did not think it right to 'speak wickedly' even 'for God,' nor to violate truth in its own promotion. We earnestly pray that all, whether they agree with him in opinion, or esteem him to have fallen into the most grievous errors, would imitate the beautiful example he has set them of truth and love. To quote again from the same authority, ('Scripture Testimony,' vol. iii., pp. 383, 384,) 'The ignorant statements, the unsound arguments, the loose declamation, the unjust imputations, and even the virulent spirit which have too often been employed on the side of truth, (thus inflicting deep wounds on that sacred cause, and conferring the most signal advantages on the opposite errors,) have had an extensive effect in urging to the inviting retreats of Unitarianism, those who have not been fortified with accurate knowledge of doctrines and evidences, or whose evangelical piety has not been strong enough to rise above injustice and unkindness.' The best friends of Christian truth are those who show most of the Christian spirit.

There is one feature of Dr. Carpenter's character to which we must just refer. Naturally amiable, and possessing strong religious tendencies, he was remarkable for the kindness and devotional temper which he displayed. His history has therefore been peculiarly interesting in this view, as presenting before us one whose Unitarianism was clear and strong, yet evidently at home in the most spiritual of all engagements, and manifesting a peculiar fondness for some of the most practical and unctuous of Trinitarian divines. It is with no wish to detract from his excellence, and while fully alive to the ungraciousness of even appearing disinclined to ascribe an adversary's goodness to his faith, that we must express our deep and solemn conviction, that Dr. Carpenter was a contrast to, rather than a representative of, his fellow Unitarians in these respects. We have yet seen no reason to deny or to suspect the peculiar efficacy of the views and sentiments we hold in opposition to Unitarianism, in relation to devotional feelings and services. It has been made more clear and certain to our minds, by all we have read and

seen of Unitarianism. We have met with some, and are ready to hope that there are many, who exhibit an attractive spirit of piety while holding that faith. These cases may be explained, we think, in perfect consistency with the opinion just expressed. There is much in the natural constitution and temperament of some minds, far more than has been as yet generally acknowledged; there is much, often, in the remnants and relics of a departed faith, in the spiritual habits which it formed when the presiding power of the soul; and there is much in the influence of those sentiments which are common both to Unitarianism and Trinitarianism, to account for these cases. But still the general and powerful tendency of the peculiar principles of Unitarianism is anti-devotional. They may be allied to intellectual power, they may be associated with high-toned morality; this, we admit, and see nothing very remarkable in it, but they do not, and it is not in their nature to generate deep and fervid piety. It would not be difficult to explain this fact, a fact which some of their own advocates have, after a fashion, allowed. It is not simply that Unitarianism is a view of Christianity which omits, altogether or in part, those truths which possess the greatest virtue in the matter of which we speak, that it banishes from the mind the best elements of spiritual devotion and earnest worship, but that it induces and springs from a mental habit exceedingly unfavourable to the admission of their reasonableness and utility.* They whose profession or whose disposition it is to attach greater importance

* We think the following sentences from the 'Preface' to 'Hymns for the Christian Church and Home,' by James Martineau, one of the most gifted and earnest of English Unitarians, exceedingly important and ominous in this view:—'Worship is an attitude which our nature assumes, not *for a purpose*, but *from an emotion*. Whenever it is genuine, it is the natural and spontaneous utterance of a mind possessed by the conception of the infinite relations in which we stand, and aspiring towards a point of view worthy of their solemnity. And though it breathes forth the deepest and greatest of desires, it is essentially an end, and not a means; and, like the embrace of friendship, or the kiss of domestic affection, loses all its meaning, when adopted from conviction of its reasonableness, or with a view to personal advantage.

'In opposition to this *natural* idea of worship stands the *utilitarian*, which considers it an 'instrumental act,' whether, according to the *sacerdotal* view, its instrumentality is thought to be mystically efficacious with God; or, according to the *rationalistic*, intelligibly beneficial to man. The statements which this last-mentioned theory makes respecting the value of worship to the conscience and the heart, are all quite true. But the churches which begin to justify their outward devotion by appeal to this consideration have already lost their inward devoutness; and the individual who, with this notion of self-operation, speaks a prayer, performs an act of disciplinary prudence, not of Christian piety, and takes the air of heaven for the sake of exercise, rather than in love of the light and quest of the immensity of God.'—pp. 5, 6.

to the dictates of reason than to the teachings of revelation, may, without exciting much astonishment, come to regard with doubt or indifference exercises which have been highly prized in all ages by humble and holy souls. He that would rather take a *philosophical* (?) than a *scriptural* view of devotional acts and services, may easily disesteem them, or entertain towards them no very warm and cordial feelings. It is worthy of notice that what we have mentioned and commended in Dr. Carpenter in this connexion, obtained for him the stern rebuke of one of his own faith, who thus wrote: 'I can have no doubt that if, during the *ebullition* of such fervid feelings, *any rational idea whatever* should chance to intrude, the *effervescence* would soon subside, and the *fantastic expectations* speedily pass away.' (*Monthly Repository*, Oct. 1820, p. 582, as quoted in 'Scripture Testimony,' vol. III., p. 441.) In opposition to all the difficulties which reason may suggest upon this subject, we are content to allege the plain and authoritative statements and commands of revelation, and while we do so, esteem the manifest harmony of our conceptions of Christian doctrine with the dispositions and practice which best agree with them as one of the strongest possible reasons for contending for our faith. It is not a thing of signs and symbols merely, or we should care but little respecting it, but it is 'the spirit and life' of the best affections and most energetic deeds of godliness.

Art. VI. *Health of Towns: an Examination of the Report and Evidence of the Select Committee on Mr. M'Kinnon's Bill; and of the Acts for establishing Cemeteries around the Metropolis.*—8vo, pp. 131. London, Snow, 1843.

These 'Letters to the Dissenters of England,' and to Mr. M'Kinnon, forming two distinct series, first appeared in the 'Patriot' newspaper, and they must therefore already have met the eye of many of our readers. When the first note of the alarum was struck, however, by the athletic eloquence of the writer, the sleepy ear of the public took in no distinct impression of the meaning of the *réveillée*, and was with difficulty roused to attention. In plain terms, the writer had to overcome not only the incuriousness and incredulity of ignorance, and the apathetic feeling which has so unaccountably overspread the public mind, but also a strong prepossession in favour of the Bill which he came forward to denounce in language of uncompromising severity. Mr. Walker had fairly inoculated the Press with his monomania, or, rather, monophobia, upon the subject of church-yard gases. His horrific discoveries had taken hold of the popular imagination. Never did a man discover more un-

wearied activity or more dogged perseverance in following up his object, than our 'Sepulchral Reformer.' In the language of the present writer, he has brought to that pursuit 'superior talents, an industry which never tires, and an enthusiasm which brooks no check. He has written repeatedly on the question, and he has talked about it without intermission. It has, at length, become in his breast a strong passion: and, on fire himself, he has succeeded in inflaming many others. He is not aware of any one who has given the same attention to the subject as himself. The result is, that he has made discoveries of a very unexpected character, for which, no doubt, the people of England will be duly grateful.' Thus invested with the triple character of a discoverer, a reformer, and a philanthropist,—to say nothing of his pretensions as chemist, leech, and author,—Mr. Walker had established his reputation as a high authority in all Cemetery matters, so much so as to be the very pivot of the parliamentary inquiry,—before his statements had been challenged, or his designs suspected, by any individual. The Author of these Letters had, therefore, a very difficult and very ungracious task to perform; first, to rouse and then to disabuse the public mind of a strong impression; to obtain a reluctant hearing upon a subject in itself uninviting, repulsive; to re-open an inquiry which had been authoritatively closed; to set aside evidence upon which a committee of the House of Commons had reported as a sufficient ground for legislation, by showing it to be fallacious and dishonest; and to compel the conviction, in itself an unwelcome one, that those whose interests would be so materially affected by the Bill, had, through unintelligent supineness, suffered a measure of spoliation and oppression to be nearly consummated without raising one word of remonstrance. All this the writer had to accomplish; and well he knew that only by stroke after stroke upon the sullen material of public opinion could any force of argument produce the desired effect. Singly, and with the almost universal Press, Conservative and Liberal, either neutral or against him, he has had to fight the battle with Mr. M'Kinnon and his Blue Book, Mr. Walker and his gravediggers, the Cemetery Company committees and their shareholders. The Author of 'Jethro,' in attacking the Bible monopoly, had not the odds so fearfully against him as the assailant of the many-headed Burial monopoly. The intellectual prowess displayed in the latter Herculean labour is of a higher order, because self-sustained, without even the aid of popular applause. The success, we trust, will not be less complete in the present instance. Much has been already achieved. In consequence chiefly of the information diffused by these Letters, and the rousing appeals they contain, a committee has been formed in

London to oppose the re-introduction of Mr. M'Kinnon's Bill, or any similar measure, which has opened communications with all parts of the country: and, as the first fruits of the movement thus originated, it has been intimated by Secretary Sir James Graham to the deputation that waited upon him, that the Government will not sanction the re-introduction of Mr. M'Kinnon's Bill, but that it was in contemplation to bring forward a measure on the same subject.

So far, so good. And yet, this apparent success may prove a serious disadvantage, if, instead of having to resist a Bill so palpably iniquitous and insolently intolerant as that of last session, the committee, and those whose interests they represent, should find themselves in the predicament of opposing a Government measure of more moderate injustice and more plausible interference with the rights and property of Dissenters. Men are sometimes more easily persuaded, after escaping from some grievous imposition or outrage, to put up with a smaller wrong. It is fortunate, perhaps, that resistance has not hitherto been called into full play, and exhausted itself upon Mr. M'Kinnon's Bill, which may now be regarded as a legislative abortion; since, after that Bill, any one that a man who valued his own character would think of introducing, must assume the semblance of a concession. This is the danger against which the committee have chiefly to guard. The object of Mr. M'Kinnon's Bill, it will be said, was good—to 'promote the health of towns;' the principle good—that of discouraging intramural sepulture; all the rest is matter of detail. Only let a bill be brought in, and it may be rendered unexceptionable in committee. This is the way in which the public too often suffer themselves to be juggled and cajoled. The primary objection to Mr. M'Kinnon's Bill would apply with equal force to any general measure of the same kind; —namely, that it was founded upon limited, partial, and, to a great extent, worthless or contradictory evidence. The Author of these Letters has shown most clearly, that the most respectable witnesses gave evidence at direct variance with the conclusions of the Select Committee. The Evidence, again, related entirely to the Metropolis; whereas the Report, and the Bill founded upon it, contemplate legislation of the most stringent kind for the whole country. Further, no witnesses known to be opposed to Mr. Walker's views were called before the Select Committee, or permitted to give evidence. We know of an instance in which a respectable individual, practically acquainted with the subject, was told that they did not want *his* evidence; it was on the wrong side. The partiality of the Select Committee is forcibly exposed in the concluding Letter of the first series.

'Another point merits notice; the witnesses were, as far as pos-

sible, culled and selected to serve a purpose. With the clerical witnesses, Mr. Mackinnon and Mr. Walker could not so well tamper: they could only speculate regarding the gentlemen that were the most safe and the most likely to serve them: and to a great extent they erred in that speculation. It was somewhat otherwise with the medical witnesses, who were friends of Walker, and most of whom wanted not the will, but the power, to sustain this most extravagant project. The weapon of the one class was opinion; the weapon of the other, fact. The medical men said, churchyards must be pernicious to health; the clergyman contended that they were wholly innoxious. The former reasoned from the principles of chemistry; the latter, from personal experience. The Bishop of London alone pounded the Doctors of Medicine as if in a mortar! They discoursed of the mortal gases which emanate from the tombs, and maintained that they must be fatal to all residents in the vicinity: the calm Prelate inly smiled at their simplicity, and replied, that both he and his household had lived a number of years in one of our most crowded churchyards in the enjoyment of perfect health. The rest of the witnesses were mostly men of a lower grade, and more easily managed; but the bulk of them knew so little of the subject as to be of slender service. The grave-diggers, therefore, were the last and only hope of our Highland Hannibal! Take away the foolish and monstrous fabrications of these poor degraded men, and what would be the effect of all the remaining Evidence?

'Such a mode of conducting the inquiry is, in the highest degree, reprehensible; but our complaint does not end here. First, the whole of the respectable body of Furnishing Undertakers has been set aside. A single score of this important class of tradesmen would have been of more real service to an upright Committee, who really sought the truth, than a thousand such witnesses as the bulk of those whom this Committee collected and mainly prized. Twenty such witnesses, selected from all the principal localities of the Metropolis, would have been able to present a truthful and satisfactory report of all the grounds within the bills of mortality, and to furnish a mass of information upon the entire subject, which can be obtained from no other source. These, too, were the men to have spoken to the subject of new cemeteries, with all the collateral points of the increased expense of sepulture, providing for the interment of the poor, and all kindred matters. The studied exclusion of such witnesses, therefore, is one of the most striking and ominous parts of Mr. Mackinnon's procedure, or rather of Mr. Walker's; for he ruled the Committee. They formed the ciphers; he, the integer. He sat beside Mr. Mackinnon, and whispered, and prompted, and practised all the dexterous parts of an able and experienced attorney guiding his counsel. Would not mere common sense have suggested that the undertakers must necessarily, on all points, be the most competent witnesses on such matters as interested the Committee? Not only were they the proper persons to speak to the state of the grounds, and to remedial measures where such might be required; but they were also the only men to speak unerringly as to the effect of the churchyards on the mortality of the people who surrounded them. On this point, the undertakers

are far better able to speak than the Doctors of Medicine. Alas! their guinea and five-guinea and ten-guinea visits are luxuries unknown to the swarming multitudes who people the precincts of the metropolitan sepulchres! Of the myriads that die there, few have to do with the M.D. ; but all require the undertaker. And, when the physician does visit that class of the population who reside there, it is seldom more than once: for more can seldom be afforded; and it is but rarely he knows whether his patient lives or dies. Common surgeons of good practice are far better judges than the physician; but even they are much inferior to the undertaker. There is much death where there is but little surgery; the undertaker, however, can nowhere be dispensed with. To him, therefore, ought the Committee to have repaired, had they wished for the true statistics of comparative mortality. We happen to know something of this class; we have also ascertained the opinions which prevail among them concerning this Bill, and the evidence by which it professes to be supported; and we assure you, that they designated the former as an impracticable absurdity, and the latter, as far as Mr. Walker and his grave-diggers are concerned, as a mere jumble of nonsense, folly, and falsehood.

'Another ground of complaint here, is, that no means whatever were taken by Mr. Mackinnon to ascertain the true condition of the Dissenting burial grounds, and the effect which his Bill would have on Dissenting property. His object being simply their destruction, he required, of course, only the knowledge of their existence. His conduct here is exceedingly aggravated by facts to which we are privy, and by which we can prove that he was fully apprised of the ruinous results of his Bill to many of the most important congregations of the Nonconformist community. He laboured not in the dark; he perpetrates all the injuries with which his Bill is fraught, in the full light of the clearest and most abundant information. Its fatal influence to you is his boast and his glory. He is, therefore, your declared adversary!'—pp. 58—60.

Now, upon such evidence as this, how can any legislative measure be with propriety or safety founded? The case was not proved. Interments in towns may or may not be injurious to public health; but that they are so is a novel opinion, an original discovery, of which Mr. Apothecary Walker claims the entire merit. Evidence of the alleged fact, as yet, we have none; nothing beyond this—that, under certain circumstances of gross abuse, culpable neglect, or unfavourable locality, consequences prejudicial to health may possibly have arisen, which call for a better enforcement of existing laws, or, perhaps, for some new regulations. The health of *individuals* may have suffered in such cases, but the health of *towns* has in no case whatever been demonstrably affected by the existence of open burial grounds: on the contrary, they have indirectly, by preventing the areas they enclose from being built upon, promoted the healthiness of towns. It may be better, on some accounts, that cemeteries should be situated out of towns; but we doubt

whether this would be any improvement, or of any benefit to public health, if their site were to be occupied with narrow streets and continuous building. To give the title of a 'Health of Towns Bill' to a mere Cemetery-Regulation Bill, is a fraudulent misnomer. Let any one who thinks this stronger language than the case warrants, turn to Mr. Chadwick's 'Report on the Causes affecting the Sanitary Condition of the Labouring Population;' and, on examining his 'Recapitulation of Conclusions,' he will find specified among the means of improving their condition—drainage, the removal of refuse, the improvement of the supplies of water, the promotion of civic, household, and personal cleanliness, structural alterations of the existing tenements, better ventilation, &c.; but not a word about cemeteries. It is true, the Appendix contains a communication from Captain Vetch, an old military engineer, in which, under the head of *Ventilation*, he recommends, for the removal of noxious vapours existing in crowded towns—1, the conversion of blind alleys into thoroughfares; 2, the continuation of leading streets through blocks of houses; 3, the opening of wide and straight streets; 4, the formation of open squares, walks, or gardens; 5, the substitution of iron railings for dead walls; and 6, *the prohibition of all burials in the Metropolis and other large towns, and the consequent diffusion of unwholesome effluvia.* This sage recommendation has a *Walkerian* stamp upon it; but it is so loosely worded, that it may be taken as an assertion, that the diffusion of unwholesome effluvia would be the consequence of *prohibiting* all burials, which is literally true. The very object of burial is to prevent effluvia, and hitherto it has been deemed a sufficient safeguard. It is obvious, however, that, in the opinion of the Poor Law Commissioners, and the medical gentlemen and others whose opinions are embodied in this valuable Report, intramural sepulture was not regarded as a very noxious practice. Even Captain Vetch places it last, and assigns no reason whatever for his opinion. What must be said, then, of a Bill to protect or promote the 'health of towns,' which, passing over everything really and obviously affecting the sanitary condition of the labouring classes, confines itself to the shutting up of burial-grounds? Why, that its authors were either charlatans or simpletons. In a happy vein of irony, the Writer of the Letters puts into the mouth of the honourable Member for Lymington the speech which he *ought* to have addressed to the Speaker of the House of Commons, in moving for leave to bring in his bill, had the facts corresponded to his premises. We had marked the passage for extract, but are precluded by want of space from transferring it to our pages.

No necessity, then, for legislative interference has been—or, we might perhaps add, can be—made out; for the evils which really

exist, in connexion with crowded burial-grounds and interments in churches, have for some time been in course of mitigation or total removal, as the effect of the competition of the Cemetery companies. In all the intramural burial-grounds, the average number of interments has been falling off, year by year; and the fact, as regards interments in churches, is, that the clergy have taken alarm at the rapid diminution of their fees. 'Never, since London was a city,' it is remarked, 'was there so little danger from intramural sepulture as at this moment, because never was there so small a number of interments in it.' From December 15, 1840, to December, 14, 1841, the total of the interments in the ninety-seven parishes within the walls, was only 582, giving an average of six to each parish; only eight parishes had more than fifteen each. The seventeen parishes without the walls had 4192 burials, of which 991 were in Southwark; and in the ten parishes of the City and Liberties of Westminster, there were only 2419 interments. These amount altogether to only 4903 interments; whereas the total mortality of the Metropolis was 45,284. We have to add, however, the burials in the out-parishes in Middlesex and Surrey, which were 9696. The 'General Bill of Christenings and Burials at the Parish Churches within the Bills of Mortality,' gives a total of 14,599 interments in grounds belonging to the Established Church. This leaves, as the number of interments in dissenting burial-grounds and cemeteries, 30,685, being two-thirds of the total number of burials. To recover for the clergy the business they have lost, and the fees attending it, is the object of Mr. M'Kinnon's preposterous Bill, the effect of which would be, 'to close all such grounds as are not already *bishop-taxed,* and to drive the whole business of burial to these and the (proposed) parochial cemeteries, thus augmenting the fees of the clergy three or fourfold.' The zeal of the honourable Member for Lymington in this affair will entitle him to a splendid mausoleum in thrice-consecrated ground. Of course, he is but the tool of other parties who do not appear, but who cannot be regarded as unknown. The very prominent part which the Bishop of London has taken in reference to Cemetery bills, the avowed principle upon which he has acted, that of making the best terms he could for the clergy, the inordinate rapacity of his exactions, to which the Cemetery companies have so unwisely and meanly submitted, and even his evidence given before Mr. M'Kinnon's Committee,—all serve to point him out as the prime mover or prompter in the business. The Author of the Letters has not spared the wily prelate; he has tracked him closely in all his extortionate jobbings with the companies, and has brought home to him the charge of clerical cupidity the most shameless, heartless, and revolting. The Bishop's model cemetery at Westminster, is shown to be established upon regulations which amount

to a wholesale plunder of the public. What makes this trading in burials on the part of the clergy the more indecent is the fact, that the exaction of any fees for burial is an abuse which has gradually and imperceptibly acquired the force and legality of custom. 'Ancient canons,' as Lord Stowell declared, 'forbid the taking of money upon interment.' And as to the superstitious rite of consecration, which enables the clergy to extort their fees, the writer shows that it neither is enjoined by the law of the land, nor has ever received formal ecclesiastical sanction.

'As a piece of Popish folly merely, it might perhaps be endured, or passed by in scorn; but the fraud involves a principle of great power and most pernicious influence. Confined to old parochial burial-grounds, it was sufficiently offensive, and abundantly mischievous in its working; but men bore with it as a hoary abuse, a reverend absurdity, supported solely by blind custom and stupid apathy, without a particle of foundation in law, reason, or Scripture. But the introduction of the modern joint-stock cemeteries, in addition to making men think, has clothed the whole subject with a new character, and presented it in a new aspect. The rite of consecration has, by this means, at length obtained a footing which it never before possessed. This unreflecting course of the Legislature has exalted it into importance. In all the Cemetery Acts, it is acknowledged as an exercise of the episcopal function, as a high and awful ceremony on which certain great consequences and important circumstances are made wholly to depend.'—pp. 107, 108.

'Why are the joint-stock cemeteries consecrated? Because otherwise the clergy would not bury in them, and thus damage would be sustained by the companies. Why are such cemeteries established by Act of Parliament? Because, without an Act the Bishop will not consecrate. Why will he not? Because, without an Act, a heavy tax on every body interred could not be secured to the clergy. The companies themselves care not a rush for the rite of consecration. Why is one portion of the ground left unconsecrated? For the accommodation of nonconformists. Out of this circumstance has arisen the odious and novel spectacle of a separation, even in death, between churchmen and dissenters. In the new cemetery at Leeds, you are aware, there is no such distinction. The 'Necropolis' at Liverpool has never been consecrated, it has no Act of Parliament, and pays no fees to the clergy. One chapel only is erected, in which the respective funeral services of all communities are performed, and the dust of all classes mingles quietly together in the bosom of its parent earth. The cemeteries of Glasgow, likewise, are the subjects of no Parliamentary Act, of no episcopal consecration, of no clerical impost. The beautiful cemetery of Abney Park is in the same condition. All these "Cities of the Dead" resemble the cities of the living. Why, Sir, did not you make *them* your model, instead of those anomalous places around London? Are you prepared to carry out your principle? Are we next to have church and dissenting carriages

on our railways? Are we then to have church and dissenting compartments on the decks and in the cabins of our steamboats? Are we, afterwards, to have new villages, towns, and cities, laid out in separate allotments for churchmen and dissenters? Are the fires of bigotry, in the nineteenth century, to spread yet further, and to blaze still higher? Must monuments of discord, at length, be reared among our sepulchres? Does the dignity of manhood, or the honour of piety, demand that the signals of our divisions should be borne to the precincts of the eternal world? In that world itself, is it thus that the spirits of men are to be classified? No! Why, then, attempt to classify the *bodies* of mankind upon principles which the Judge of all flesh will not apply to their immortal spirits? Let not purblind mortals invade the province of the Omniscient! Leave Him to perform unerringly the awful work of everlasting separation!'—pp. 110, 111.

This is vigorous eloquence, warm from the heart of the writer; and the Letters abound with similar passages. Sometimes, rising above his subject, he assumes a tone of lofty rebuke becoming a Christian moralist; and, again, kindling with indignation, he lashes the offending parties with a power of sarcasm not often surpassed.

We must make room for one more passage, relating to a subject upon which we have scarcely touched, the wholesale robbery and spoliation which the Bill would have inflicted upon the Dissenters. Everything appertaining to the Establishment is treated, in the Report and the Bill founded on it, as a vested right. The claims of the clergy are indefeasible; the emoluments of parish-clerks are sacred; even those of the sextons are not overlooked; but the idea of compensating any Dissenters for the actual annihilation of their property, is treated with utter scorn.

'We should like much to know, how, amidst all this solicitude to preserve 'vested rights' intact, you excluded from your thoughts all regard to the rights of the class of people called Dissenters? A stranger might be led to suppose you were not aware of the existence of such people. But this cannot be, since we find you, in your Bill, carefully providing indignity for the *dead* dissenter, and taxation for the living one! In the Evidence, too, we observe, and have in previous letters reprobated, your anxiety to have it proved, that the profits of sepulture are one of the main supports of the dissenting interest; that, but for these, many of its metropolitan chapels would never have existed; and that their continuance chiefly depends on the same source. Sir, if these allegations be true, will not your Bill bring on the Dissenters of England a most grievous calamity? Will it not prove the ruin of all or most of their town and city chapels? Is such an event, assuming its probability, or even its possibility, beneath your notice? If it inflict severe pain on multitudes, is it not cruelty? If it destroy property, is it not injustice? If it impair the religious privileges of numbers of Christian men, is it not impiety? On what ground, then, do you rest your right, or consider it your duty, to propose a measure

which is revolting to justice, honour, and religion? Have you, a senator, to learn that, next to life, it is your first duty to protect property? But you deliberately destroy it, while your deed is accompanied with neither explanation nor apology.

'Let us calmly look at this matter of property, as it relates to families. Your Report, indeed, recommends the exception of 'family vaults already existing, the same partaking of the nature of private property, and being of limited extent.' Why this style of mitigated expression? If we purchase a vault under a chapel, or a grave, with the power to use, or to reserve, or to sell it, is not such vault or grave, in the fullest sense, our 'private property.' What can be more so? Do, then, tell us why, without recompence, you take it from us? On what ground do you withhold compensation? But, Sir, this is the lowest view: your Bill is not merely a piece of injustice, it is an act of inhumanity. It inflicts wrongs which gold cannot repair. Is it, in your mind, a light thing to separate families in death? Why do you touch a family grave more than a family mansion? Why dare you practise upon the dead, that which you would not even dare to imagine with respect to the living? Why deprive parents and children of the awful privilege of sleeping in the same sepulchre? Sir, such conduct is fraught with consequences the most solemn and responsible. The tomb is not a fit place for the wanton freaks of tyros in legislation! Such unhallowed liberties with sacred dust may be endured in infidel France, and among the slave subjects of the despotic governments of Europe, but we do trust it will not be suffered in England. Surely the spirit of her people is not yet so fallen! Her feelings of reverence for the dead are not yet so blunted!

'While we thus remonstrate with you on the impiety of your conduct, and denounce its injustice, we feel that we are pleading not simply for Protestant Dissenters, but also for Churchmen. You have assumed the attitude of the ruthless spoiler of the common sepulchre! You merit to be considered a common enemy! 'It shall be lawful for Churchwardens of any parish,' after five years, to level graves, demolish tombstones, and erase the memorials of many generations, and 'to cause' the ravaged mansion of the dead 'to be planted with shrubs or trees,' or to be appropriated to any public use or benefit; and after 'twenty years,' such ground may be excavated to any depth, and the bones and dust of our parents, wives, and children, carted off by wagon-loads, and shot into the nearest brick-field! Sir, are you fond enough to believe that an outrage so gross, and so full of abomination, will be tolerated by Englishmen?'—pp. 73—75.

But, alas! what will not be tolerated by Englishmen? The most extraordinary circumstance connected with the whole proceeding is, that there seemed every chance of its being quietly consummated without a remonstrance being raised against its gross injustice by the parties who would have been most deeply wronged. And even the annihilating exposure it has now drawn forth, has apparently failed to produce the full impression which might have been expected, or to rouse the country to a sense of the impending danger. We have no doubt that the committee

formed for opposing the re-introduction of the Bill will do their duty; but the indolent false confidence which leaves everything to be done by metropolitan committees cannot be too strongly reprobated. It was not more incumbent upon the Dissenters of London, than upon those of Manchester, Liverpool, or Bristol, to acquaint themselves with what was passing in parliament, and to originate opposition to a Bill affecting their interests as soon as its provisions became known. It may be urged that there are Societies in the Metropolis who are expected to look after these matters. But are these Societies supported by the country, and enabled to maintain the expense of an effective agency? The Dissenters of England have only to thank themselves, if content with a representation which does not provide them with one vigilant guardian of their rights and interests in parliament, upon whom they have a right to depend, they grudge even the few thousands a-year that might, in the hands of an effective central committee, supply the lack of such representatives, by giving at least timely intimation of threatened encroachments or wrongs, and directing energetic opposition against them.

Art. VII. *Original Hymns: adapted to General Worship and Special Occasions.* By various Authors; and edited by the Rev. J. Leifchild, D.D. London: Ward and Co. 1842.

Congregational psalmody might be what it has not yet been, and what none of our existing books will make it. It is in a course of improvement, but has not yet attained that perfection of which it is susceptible. No preliminary objection against Dr. Leifchild's volume can be taken with justice, derived from the number of evangelical hymn-books already in existence. Every attempt to rectify errors and supply defects in relation to so important a part of public worship ought to be received with a benign countenance. The respected editor of this work has adopted a different principle, too, from that which has guided the compiler of any other hymn-book that has come under our notice. Many attempts have been made to comprise in one book all the hymns necessary for congregational purposes, including a selection from the compositions of Watts; and many volumes have appeared intended as Supplements to the Psalms, Hymns, and Spiritual Songs of that benefactor of the British churches; but we do not remember any previous collection from which all hymns contained in existing hymn-books were systematically excluded. None of the hymns before us, it is alleged, have ever been incorporated in a regular collection for congregational use, and the majority of them were composed expressly for the present work.

Few congregations, it is probable, will be willing to part at once with all the compositions of Watts, Doddridge, Steele, Newton, Cowper, and many others of kindred spirit, to which they have been accustomed. Were any to do so, we cannot promise that they would find in this volume adequate compensation; they would soon desire, we believe, a greater variety than it affords, and would resort to the older books to supply its deficiencies. Guarding against the supposition that we advise the substitution of this volume for others in general use, we are, however, quite ready to commend it to our readers, as a work of general excellence, which may be advantageously employed both in public and private devotion.

Its origin and design are explained in the Preface:—

'A want was felt by the congregation, for whose use it is principally intended, of a greater variety than was to be found in the collections generally used. Admirable as are many of these selections, yet most of them are supplied from the same general stock, with a small addition of original or new hymns. At first, the compiler of the present volume intended to adopt, for the use of his own congregation, some one of those well-known collections as an appendix to Dr. Watts; but the suggestion of a judicious friend, who was consulted, induced the conclusion that an addition to the stock of our sacred poetry, fitted for public worship, could it be effected, would prove both generally useful and acceptable. This conclusion was enforced by the reason, not trivial in itself, that the improved taste of the present age, in the peculiar province of poetical composition, might thereby be met, and many faults avoided, which, though generally perceived and deplored, were sheltered by custom and sacred association which all are disposed to regard with a lenient eye. The design of producing a volume altogether *new* was, therefore, entertained. The attempt has been made, and the result is now before the public.

'It is not requisite to specify all the faults, or even the principal, which are descernible in various hymn-books. The imperfect rhyme in some, and the total disregard of it in others, especially in the first and third lines of hymns in the usual metres, must long have been offensive to those whose taste in poetry is at all refined. In the age of Dr. Watts, the venerated father of this species of our sacred poetry, the beauty, harmony, and piety of whose hymns and psalms are rarely equalled, and still more rarely surpassed, defects of rhyme were much less offensive, as Mr. Montgomery observes, than in 'this more fastidious age.' This is an objection which ought to have weight; and if it can be superseded by removing the fault on which it rests, no slight advantage will be gained. The force of this objection has been so far appreciated, by all who have contributed to the present volume, that the utmost care has been taken to avoid the alleged fault; and it is hoped and believed, not without such a measure of success as to leave the volume nearly, if not altogether, free from such blemishes.'

The execution corresponds, in this respect, with the design. Defects of rhyme have been scrupulously avoided, and the versi-

fication is unexceptionable. In another particular of still greater importance, we find an entire freedom from blemishes found in the compositions of Watts and others: there is no phraseology offensive to good taste in reference to the divine and human natures of the Mediator, or the relations of the Father, Son, and Spirit. The theology is uniformly excellent. On the other hand, in some pages, we have regretted a want of that simplicity of expression becoming a creature addressing his Creator, especially in an assembly of persons of all ages and diversities of education. More prevalent still, is the fault, as we account it, of being too didactic. We should have been glad to find a greater proportion of the hymns in the form of direct address to the object of worship; but in some of those which bear this form, we find sentiments expressed which do not appear to be part of the effusion of the heart towards Deity, but are apparently intended to promote the religious knowledge of the worshippers, or caution them against errors on the subject to which the hymn refers. Some topics also which are suitable for the pulpit, are not adapted, in our judgment, for introduction into hymns for congregational use. We cannot imagine with complacency a congregation singing of the condemnation of the ungodly, as in the following verse:—

> 'Go, ye cursed, hence, depart,
> Outcasts, to the realms below;
> Thunders to the guilty heart,
> Thus pronounce the doom of woe:
> With the fiend you cherish'd dwell;
> Plunge into the deeps of hell.'—*Hymn* 105.

A very large proportion of the compositions in this volume are, however, precisely what hymns for public worship should be. As a specimen, the following may be taken, entitled 'Universal Praise.'

> '1 All thy works with one accord,
> Magnify thee, mighty Lord;
> While the heavens thy glory show,
> Earth extols thy love below.
>
> 2 Day to day doth utter speech,
> Night to night thy knowledge teach;
> Nature's universal frame
> Echoes, 'Hallowed be thy name!'
>
> 3 Life, through all its breathing forms,
> Death, from darkness, dust, and worms,
> In ten thousand wondrous ways,
> Fearfully set forth thy praise.
>
> 4 Here the lips of infancy
> Sweet hosannas sing to thee;

Youth and age, in louder lays,
Joyful hallelujahs raise.

5 While adoring seraphim
Thine eternal Godhead hymn,
Saints redeem'd, with victory crown'd,
Calvary's cross-won triumphs sound.

6 May the church, from age to age,
In her house of pilgrimage,
Train for thee her convert throngs,
And thy statutes be their songs.'—*Hymn* 10.

This is from the pen of Mr. Montgomery, as are ten others. Mrs. Gilbert has contributed one hundred; Dr. Collyer, thirty-nine; the Rev. W. M. Bunting, thirty-four; Mr. Cottle, twenty-one; Mr. Conder, eight; others, whose names are given, a few; and some, whose names are not given, single hymns; twenty are taken from a volume never yet published, by Mr. Charles Wesley.

Much exquisite poetry breathing a holy and heavenly spirit will be found in this collection. Many of the hymns which are not in our judgment adapted for congregational use, are admirably suited for private worship and select assemblies. At prayer-meetings and at social parties, variety is peculiarly desirable; and to those on whom it devolves to conduct devotional exercises on such occasions, we especially commend this volume.

Art. VIII. *The Three Prize Essays on Agriculture and the Corn Law.* Published by the National Anti-Corn-Law League. Manchester: Gadsby. London: Groombridge, Ridgway. 1842.

On a subject which is so extensively engaging public attention, it is necessary to compress. The object here will therefore be, to set down what appears to be the cream and substance of all that has hitherto been ascertained on the point immediately in question.

That point is, the mode in which the restrictions on the introduction of foreign corn affect the home agriculturists; and afterwards the Essays will be referred to in corroboration.

The agriculturists of all classes to a certain extent, and in some classes to a very preponderating extent, appear to be arriving at the conclusion, that their expectation of ultimate advantage from the imposition of the corn laws has been a grand mistake. The agricultural labourers feel the daily evidence that it has not preserved *them* from the extreme of suffering; by which the onus appears to be thrown upon the other side, of proving that it is not at least highly probable that it has operated as a cause. And the way in which it has so acted, may readily

be surmised to be, that by reducing the whole of the operative population to one general pressure of their numbers against food, it has created an impossibility that the agricultural portion should do other than share the general condition.

The farmers are rapidly finding out that, in addition to the large share of delusion thrown round the subject by their inattention to the fact that rents were the great levellers of the gains or losses which were to arise to them from the greater or smaller permanent price of corn, they have overlooked the way in which they are brought to inevitable suffering through the impossibility of finding employment for their increasing numbers. A highly intelligent individual resident at Manchester, the son of a Scottish farmer, was at the pains of making an inquiry into the condition of all the farmers' children he recollected in his boyhood; and the result was of the kind which follows.—One son of a family had been established on a farm; one daughter was married to some individual similarly established; and the rest were struggling in various branches of trade and commerce, or dispersed in the colonies and foreign possessions, or, in the case of women, were married to individuals in those circumstances. The accordance was so general, as manifestly to constitute a general rule.

The landowners, as being the actual constructors of the law, have, as might be expected, made the least progress in the discovery of their mistake; but they too are arriving gradually at the conviction, that any increase of their money rents which they are likely to derive, will speedily be balanced, in ordinary cases, by the impossibility of supporting children except by the subdivision of the family property, in a manner closely analogous to that which has been seen operating in the case of the farmers. The increasing difficulty of pushing sons into any of the employments which are to the taste of persons of their class,—

'Church, army, physic, law,'—

without expenditure or risk in various ways, to an amount which is in the end equivalent to the intimated subdivision of the family property, is the instrument by which this part of nature's plan is brought to pass, with as much certainty and effect as the changes of temperature in the various climates of the earth affect the migration of animals, and other physical phenomena.

To extend the conviction of the general influence of the evil, is to take the most practical method for accelerating its removal. But there is one phenomenon which may be considered as only beginning to appear, and to which public attention may usefully be directed. Supposing the necessity of absolute abolition to be admitted, there is left an almost unlimited ground for debate

on the question of gradual or immediate. And here it is that the new, and to most persons unexpected, appearance has arisen. The wild wit of Ireland has furnished an illustration so ludicrously exact, that it would be a grave loss to state the question without a reference to its terms. An officer in Ireland had a dog, of one of those kinds which the thoughtlessness of fashion directs should be deprived of that useful appendage the tail; and he was annoyed, not once, but monthly, by howlings which indicated that the poor animal was suffering a painful operation. At last he demanded an explanation; when, 'Sir,' replied his servant, 'I cut off his tail a little at a time, because I thought he could not bear it all at once.' Just so the farmers are understood to be protesting against having the operation performed a little at a time; and the reason they give is a very clear one:—they say that the grand reduction will necessitate a new settlement of rents; whereas, if it were conducted piecemeal, it would be attended with a perpetual effort, on the part of the landlords, to disguise and struggle with the necessity of change. And in this there would seem to be nothing but practical good sense.

Mr. George Hope, tenant farmer, of 'Fenton Barns, by Haddington,' applies himself to impress on the tenant farmers and their labourers the degree in which they have miscalculated their interest; and it is impossible for any but personal witnesses to estimate the respect with which his arguments are received by the clear-headed and cautious generation of whom he forms a part.

'Let me offer an opinion as to the *mode* of repealing the Corn Law. It is apparent to every observing man that a tax upon bread will not be permanently borne in any shape. Neither fixed duties nor sliding scales will much longer be tolerated. Public opinion has decreed the overthrow of the entire system of miscalled protection, and the question now is one of *time* only. I have a strong conviction that nothing can be so unfavourable to your interests as the lingering death of the Corn Law. Whatever modifications take place short of total repeal, the burden will be thrown, if possible, under all sorts of pretences, upon the farmers. The experience of the late changes in the Tariff and the Corn Law has shown this pretty plainly. The landowners have laboured to convince you, at your recent agricultural gatherings, that the alterations in the late session have had little effect upon prices. They still try to assure you that the *law* will afford you ample protection. But, even if the law did protect you, (which it never did and never will,) what guarantee have you that the political landowners will not come to an agreement again in London next session, as they did in the last, with Sir Robert Peel, and consent to another alteration? Depend upon it, there is no chance of your coming to a satisfactory adjustment of rents and leases, *so long as you allow the intervention of politics in your bargains with the landowners.* Politics may be a winning game to those who have their own arrangements to make with the minister

of the day, but I pity the case of the farmer who reckons any Corn Law for the value of a farthing, in making a bargain for his farm with his landlord. So long as the owners of your farms can point to *a law*, as a reason for obtaining a certain price for their produce, you will in no case be able to make a safe agreement for the use of their land. Get rid of all such interferences with your dealings at once. Let the Corn Laws be totally and immediately repealed, and then every tenant throughout the kingdom will at once be brought on fair terms to a settlement with his landlord. Public opinion and the necessities of the case will then force an equitable adjustment of rents and leases; and the dealings between landlord and tenant will thenceforth settle down into mere matters of business, with which politics will no longer interfere.

'I now address myself to you—the farm labourers, for it is unblushingly declared that it is on your account, too, that we enjoy a Corn Bill. If you have attended to the preceding remarks, you will have observed what I think I have satisfactorily established, that, though the Bread Tax was abolished to-morrow, we should still possess the fertile soil of Britain, and that ploughing, sowing, and harrowing would go on much as usual. It has been said that, with low-priced food, a reduction in wages would immediately follow, but we see high-priced grain in Ireland, and wages from 8*d.* to 1*s.* a day, while the same quantity of labour in America, with low-priced food, would earn a dollar, or 4*s.* 2*d.*; so that it must be an undoubted proposition that the wages of labour, like every thing else, depend upon the supply and the demand. The only real connexion between wages and the price of food is, simply, that the labourer's wages must be sufficient at least to keep soul and body together, while all past history proves that abundant seasons, or a plentiful supply of food, tend to raise both the real and nominal wages of labour. When the means of living are cheap, many labourers are tempted to leave their masters and become independent workmen. A large number of farm servants throughout the kingdom lodge and board with their masters, their board and lodging being usually esteemed equivalent to about half their wages; so that, when food is cheap, many farmers prefer (correctly for their own interest) taking on more hands, to sending the subsistence fund to market. This demand occasionally raises the money wages paid to the labourers. When provisions are easily obtained, labourers can afford to be occasionally idle; at least, they are not so readily obliged to agree to the terms offered by masters as in dear years, which so increase the difficulty of obtaining subsistence, that workmen are glad to close with the first offer of employment. But it is not so long since 1836. You may remember the demand for labour, the rate of wages, and the price of grain at that time, and compare it with what you experienced last year. It has been found that, in every country, wages are high in proportion as the people are increasing in wealth; that however wealthy a nation may be, if that wealth be stationary, wages are very moderate; but when a nation retrogrades, the working classes die off from absolute starvation. Now, free and unrestricted commerce is the only means that can give Britain a chance to continue to progress; without it we must even go back. When it is recollected that millions in this country

exist by manufacturing goods for foreign markets, which our own policy is constantly losing us, this will be at once conceded. Unless this policy is speedily changed and we accept, as payment for our manufactures, American flour, Dantzic wheat, Baltic timber, and Brazilian sugar, an immense proportion of our population must inevitably be starved off through famine, which God forbid! or, what is almost equally to be deprecated, compete with you, the agricultural labourers, in your already over-stocked market. If there is one class more interested than another in this great question, it is you. With the impetus which every one admits Free Trade in food would give to our manufacturing body, I ask, is it too much to expect, that at least a portion of your number would be drawn off to that class, and thus leave a better remuneration to those who should remain? An additional demand for manufactures would raise the price of goods, and increase the profits of capital; workmen would be better paid, so that they and their families might enlarge their consumption of agricultural produce, to the benefit of all classes.'—*Essay by Mr. George Hope*, p. 13.

One other remarkable point in Mr. Hope's publication is, that he fairly looks in the face and acknowledges the possibility and propriety of getting rid of the apparent difficulty on the subject of *leases*, by legislative interference.

'Farmers without leases should have little cause to complain of free trade in grain, as they can have no difficulty in making new arrangements with their landlords, if such shall be found necessary. Those paying *grain rents*, we have shown, do not require any alteration. There remain however those tenants with leases, paying *money rents*, who may be entitled to relief so far by act of parliament, as that their money rents should be converted into grain at the average prices of the last five or six years, and be regulated for the future accordingly. Supposing that the said average price for wheat should be found to be 3*l.* per quarter (less or more), then for every 3*l.* of rent now paid, the price of one quarter of wheat should be paid hereafter. Justice demands that this be done, and nothing more.'—*Ib.*, p. 11.

It is of course to be understood, that 'for the future' and 'hereafter' apply to the unexpired portion of the lease; for afterwards the question comes under the influence of a new bargain, as was contemplated at the formation of the lease. The removal of one difficulty is encouragement to speculate on the removal of another; and the query may be raised, whether the same interference of legislation which solves the knot in the case of leases, might not be competent to effect something similar in the case of *mortgages* and *residuary legatees*, though confessedly more abstruse and complicated. The difficulty seems to consist in ascertaining the portion of the property which it might be in the contemplation of the testator to leave to the residuary legatee. And of this, a measure of a certain degree of accuracy appears to be discoverable, in the calculation of the portion of the general proceeds which went in that direction *before* the alteration in the

Corn Laws; or by taking the average of corresponding cases, where there has not been time for the experiment in the case particularly concerned. There seems, in fact, to be no alternative, between doing something, and leaving things to take their course.

Mr. Arthur Morse, of Swaffham in Norfolk, applies himself to the removal of the errors under which the labourers have suffered, on the subject of a supposed connexion between high wages and dear prices.

'The common sense and experience of mankind would tell us that cheap bread is better for a poor man than dear bread; and the first and most obvious answer to the question, why should it be so? is, because it is plentiful—its abundance is the cause of its cheapness. But it is asserted that the labourer's wages are generally reduced to such a price as to enable him to get but little more than the same amount of food at all times, with scarcely any increase in years of abundance. That this is very nearly the case in England is a lamentable fact, and partially but not wholly true. But it is not of what the condition of the labourer is, but of what it might be, that I have to speak. It is not that instances can be quoted which show that people in a state of political servitude and dependence may be constantly and permanently degraded in their situation, whatever may be the price of the necessaries of life. Of these there are unfortunately too many instances; but that, other circumstances being equal, the condition of the working man must be advanced by the increased production of anyarticle of his daily consumption, it is impossible to deny; that wages rise with a falling price of corn is the rule,—that they fall, is the exception to the rule.

'With regard to the distribution of the particular article of corn, through the various classes of society, it may be observed, that there is not much more consumed in the houses of the wealthy in years of abundance than in years of scarcity. The corn over and above the quantity consumed by the farmer or the producer of corn, must be brought to market and sold in the course of time, for it would not keep without injury, and the interest of the money would always prevent corn being held for many years together. Now if it should happen that either from an abundant harvest, or increased importation from abroad, the quantity of corn produced should suddenly or permanently amount to a million or two of quarters more than before, it is clear that the relative quantity of corn compared with the quantity of labourers in existence for the time being is altered. Instead of there being 90 quarters of corn to 100 labourers, there are 100 quarters of corn to 100 labourers. The farmer is a seller of corn, and the labourer is a large buyer and consumer of corn. Here is a bargain to be made between the two parties as to the amount of corn to be given for a certain quantity of work, and the principle that comes into operation here is precisely the same as that of two men going into the market, each with something to sell. One has apples and the other has eggs to dispose of. If apples are abundant and eggs are scarce, the man wishing to obtain eggs for his apples, must give a larger quantity of apples than he would have done if apples had been scarce. This is the prin-

ciple which regulates the exchange of all commodities, of which man has a surplus to dispose of that he cannot consume himself; and it is this principle which operates in the same way between two men dealing, the one for labour and the other for corn. If corn is abundant, and a man is able to earn as much in four days as will keep him for six, it is not likely that he will give his other two days' labour for nothing. Our corn laws alter the relative supply of labour and corn,—our corn laws make a provision that corn shall be less plentiful, but they make no provision that the number of the labourers should not increase—the relative supply of labour and corn is altered, and the consequence to the labourer is that he gets less for his share of the produce of the soil than he otherwise would.'—*Essay of Mr. Arthur Morse*, p. 10.

Mr. W. R. Greg, of Caton, Lancaster, confirms the principles maintained on the same subject.

'But the wages of the labourer are not only *not raised* in proportion to the price of corn;—it admits of certain demonstration, that in the long run they are actually lowered by the operation of the corn-laws. That these laws have the effect of curtailing *both the foreign and the home demand*, for the products of manufacturing industry, we shall take for granted, because it has been so repeatedly proved, and is now so generally acknowledged, that all reasoning upon the subject here would be superfluous. In proportion as they have this effect, they limit the extension of manufactures, and the employment of the people therein. They limit the demand for labour, and consequently lessen its remuneration.

'The number of individuals occupied in the cultivation of the soil has not increased, and will not increase, with the extension of that cultivation. On the contrary, it has diminished, and we have no doubt will continue to diminish, unless some such change should take place in our system of agriculture as shall approach to garden cultivation. In the ten years ending with 1830, we know that tillage had been much extended, and that large additional quantities of land had been brought under the plough. The number of enclosure bills passed during that period was 205; yet, during that period, the number of families engaged in agriculture had *decreased* from 978,500 to 961,000; while 470,000 families had been added to our total population. The returns of the last ten years, from 1831 to 1841, have not yet been published; but we will venture to predict, that, when published, they will show a similar result. From this we draw two conclusions, which admit of no denial:—*first*, that the economy of labour by the introduction of improved modes of culture more than counterbalances the demand for labour by fresh land being brought under the plough;—and consequently, *in the second place*, that it is not to any advance in agriculture that our increasing population must look for employment and support. We believe that our soil now employs its maximum of labourers, though it certainly does not yield its maximum of produce.

'But the population of Great Britain multiplies at the rate of 200,000 annually, of whom three-fourths, or 150,000, must be estimated to belong to the working classes, who must either starve or live upon charity, or subsist by the labour of their hands. Employment must

be found for 150,000 additional pair of hands every year. As long as trade and commerce prosper, they will find this employment in manufacturing pursuits, and the subsidiary crafts;—when trade and commerce are depressed and blighted, they will be thrown back upon the land, either to live in idleness upon its fruits, *or by competition to depress the wages of the farming labourer.* Hitherto the course of events has happily followed the former alternative; but the time for the latter is fast approaching, nay, has actually commenced; and, unless the corn-laws are speedily removed, it can no longer be arrested. Now, we have seen that no additional hands are required for the cultivation of the soil;—in fact, their numbers are already redundant. What, then, must be the effect of the annual influx of 150,000 additional labourers into a market already overstocked? What but *ruinously to depress the wages of labour,—the price of the only commodity the poor man has to sell?* The conclusion is as certain as any in arithmetic, that *such a check to the advance of manufactures as the corn-laws are fast bringing about, will infallibly reduce the earnings of the agricultural labourer to the very lowest point at which even the most uncomfortable life can be sustained,—far below even their present pitiful amount.*

'As to what the corn-law *has* effected, some controversy may arise. As to what it has not effected, there can be no controversy whatever; since it must be evident to the dullest understanding, that what has not been effected at all cannot have been effected by the corn-law.

'The corn-laws, then, have *not* made farmers prosperous,—have *not* made prices steady,—have *not* raised nor maintained the wages of the labourer. Yet these were the *avowed* objects for which they were enacted. The object they *have* effected was one which was *not* avowed—viz., to raise the rents of the landlords:—and this they have effected at the expense of undermining that national prosperity by the continuance of which alone can high rents be permanently secured. With the blind unthrift which is the usual companion and corrective of rapacity, they have killed the goose which laid their golden eggs.'—*Essay of Mr. W. R. Greg*, p. 17.

The lines last quoted contain so precisely what it might have been desirable to insert as the conclusion of this article, that it seems unnecessary to incur the charge of repetition.

Literary Intelligence.

In the Press.

Anglo-Catholicism not Apostolical. Being an Inquiry into the Scriptural Authority of the leading doctrines advocated in the 'Tracts for the Times.' By W. Lindsay Alexander, M.A.

A Hebrew Grammar: containing a Copious and Systematic Development of the Etymology and Punctuation of that Language. By Samuel Ransom, Classical and Hebrew Tutor in Hackney Theological Seminary. To be published by subscription. In one vol. 8vo.

Just Published.

The Bible in Spain; or, the Journeys, Adventures, and Imprisonments of an Englishman in an Attempt to Circulate the Scriptures in the Peninsula. By George Borrow. 3 vols.

The Works of William Jay, Corrected and Revised by himself. Vol. V. Memoirs of the late Rev. Cornelius Winter.

Expository Lectures on the First Four Chapters of the Gospel according to Matthew, with one on Chapter V. 21—26. By Rev. W. Blackley, B.A.

The Norwood Schools: a Sketch of their State and Progress in reference to Religion. By Rev. Joseph Brown, M.A.

Le Keux's Memorials of Cambridge. No. 38.

Health of Towns; an Examination of the Report and Evidence of the Select Committee; of Mr. Mackinnon's Bill, and of the Acts for Establishing Cemeteries around the Metropolis.

Six Views of Infidelity. By the Rev. Joseph Fletcher. Part I. The Creed of Infidelity. Part II. The Biography of Infidelity.

The Pictorial Edition of Shakspere. Shakspere in Germany. Indexes, &c.

The Church of England Examined by Scripture and Tradition, in Answer to Lectures by the Rev. John Venn, of Hereford, on the Christian Ministry. By R. Mackenzie Beverley.

Vindication of the Complete Suffrage Union. By Dr. Henry Edwards. Second Edition.

The Whole Case of the Unbeneficed Clergy. By a Presbyter of the Church (of England).

The Life and Times of Girolamo Savonarola, Illustrating the Progress of the Reformation in Italy during the Fifteenth Century.

True Stories from the History of the Church. By the Rev. Thomas King.

A Memoir of Ebenezer Birrell, late of Stepney College, London. By his Brother. Second Edition.

Readings and Conversations on Church History, especially intended for the Young. By a Grandfather.

Tracts for the People: a Course of Lectures on the General Coincidence of the Peculiar Doctrines of the Tractarians with those of the Church of Rome. By the Rev. M. W. Foye, M.A., Curate of St. Martin's, Birmingham.

The Life of Robert Pollok, author of the 'Course of Time.' By his brother, David Pollok, A.M.; with Selections from his MSS.

The Family Choir; or, Psalms, Hymns, &c., for Social Worship, arranged for Four Voices, and for the Pianoforte or Organ. Part III.

Two New Arguments in Vindication of the Genuineness and Authenticity of the Revelation of St. John. By John Collier Knight.

Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology. Edited by William Smith, Ph. D. Illustrated by numerous Engravings. Part I. ABAEUS—ALEXIS.

The Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of England Identified with Jewish Wickedness: a Sermon. By Rev. W. B. Davies.

The Practical Arithmetic. By John Darby, Leeds.

Useful Hints to Teachers. Published under the direction of the Home and Colonial Infant School Society.

The Reminiscences of an Old Traveller in Different Parts of Europe; including Historical Details of the Russian Empire, and Anecdotes of the Court. By Thomas Brown, Esq. Fourth Edition, enlarged.

Anti-Popery; or, Popery Unreasonable, Unscriptural, and Novel. By John Rogers. Third Edition, revised and improved.

Memoirs of the Life, Ministry, and Character of the Rev. William Jones. By Rev. Richard Rymer.

A Memorial of Miss Mary M'Owan. By her Father.

THE

ECLECTIC REVIEW

For MARCH, 1843.

Art. I. 1. *The Kingdom of Christ delineated in Two Essays on our Lord's own account of His Person and the Nature of his Kingdom, and on the Constitution, Powers, and Ministry of a Christian Church, as appointed by himself.* By Richard Whately, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin. London: Fellows. 1842.

2. *A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of London, at the Visitation in October*, 1842. By Charles James, Lord Bishop of London. Third Edition. London: Fellows. 1842.

There is no subject in the discussion of which more mischief has arisen from the ambiguity and disputed meaning of terms than theology. It is hardly too much to say, that a large proportion of the voluminous theological controversies which have worn out the lives of writers and the patience of readers owe their origin to the want of a preliminary understanding on both sides, of the precise acceptation of terms. For want of this, polemical divinity too frequently assumes the character of unedifying and frivolous logomachy, and resembles more the cynical disputations of the schools, than earnest researches into those momentous principles on which the destinies of mankind are suspended.

It is true that this inconvenience has not been specially experienced of late in the confounding of doctrinal discussions, inasmuch as these have less occupied the Christian world in recent times. But it introduces the confusion of Babel into the more comprehensive dispute by which Christian society is at present agitated:—a dispute involving far higher interests than belong to the minor items of a creed,—affecting not the details but the essence of Christianity,—touching not what particular doctrines are to be received, or what is the most accurate interpretation of

certain parts of Scripture; but including the entire vitality of the Christian religion. No less a question than whether mankind are to receive the blessings of the gospel doled out as to paupers by the officers of a corporation, or whether they are to possess it in all its plenitude, to enjoy its blessings without human restraint, and to follow its guidance without human dictation. This we say is the contest now raging between ecclesiastical establishments and the Christian church.

We are aware that some persons will affirm that the two parties last mentioned are identical. Religious establishments *constitute* the church, say the Bishop of London and his associates, *L'etat c'est moi!* It is the object of this article to sift such pretensions with that careful scrutiny which their magnitude demands.

In the dispute, then, thus alluded to, there are certain words and phrases which greatly perplex the discussion. We refer chiefly to the following—'The church,' 'the authority of the church,' 'the intention of the church,' and the like; such terms evidently implying that what is understood by 'the church,' is a legislative and authoritative body. It may be instructive to inquire whether such a body ever actually existed, and if so, whether it still exists, and where. The term church, as originated by the sacred writers, and in the Scriptures, has only two meanings,—the one primary and essential, the other secondary, and derivative. In the first of these it designates the whole body of the faithful servants of God in all ages; as where it is said, 'To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by *the church* the manifold wisdom of God,' Eph. iii. 10. And again, '*The church* which he has purchased with his blood.' In other places it is used in the secondary sense, but always with a sole reference to the servants of God; thus—'Unto the *church* of God which is at Corinth, to them that are *sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints*,' Cor. i. 1, 2. 'The *churches* in Judea which *were in Christ*,' Gal. i. 22. 'For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all *churches* of *the saints*,' Cor. xiv. 1, 33. Now it is evident that the term cannot be used in either of these scriptural acceptations, when the intention, authority, or will of the *church* is spoken of. Since, in the first acceptation, the nature of the case clearly precludes the expression of any universal intention or authoritative degree; while it is equally obvious that the secondary sense is not the one intended, else our modern ecclesiastical writers would qualify the general term in some such way as the following—'The authority of the *church at Exeter*,' 'The intention of the *church at Cheltenham*,' or, 'the will of the *church at Stony Stratford*.'

It may be well further to inquire, whether in the use of such

terms as 'the will, authority, or intention of the *church*,' an inspired, or an uninspired body of men is intended. If the former, then it would seem more natural and intelligible to substitute for them such phrases as the '*Will of God*,' 'the authority of the Holy Scriptures.' But this obviously is not what is meant. The only alternative therefore is, that the body referred to is of *uninspired* men, and on this hypothesis it becomes important to consider who are the persons referred to, and wherein their authority consists.

Perhaps it will be replied to our first query, that the fathers of the early churches constitute the authoritative body referred to. This would unquestionably be the general answer, and in one respect it would be a wise one, since it obviously is the part of policy to remove rather disputable pretensions to the greatest practicable distance from inspection. The entire futility and hollowness of this position cannot be more satisfactorily exposed, than in the candid but pungent observations of Archbishop Whately, in his essay on the constitution of a Christian church.

'For when referred,' says he, 'to the works of the orthodox ancient fathers, they find that a very large portion of these works are lost; or that some fragments or reprints of them by other writers alone remain; they find again that what *has* come down to us is so vast in amount that a life is not sufficient for the attentive study of even the chief part of it; they find these authors by no means agreed, on all points, with each other, or with themselves, and that learned men again are not agreed in the interpretation of *them;* and still less agreed as to the orthodoxy of each, and the degree of weight due to his judgment on several points; nor even agreed by some centuries as to the degree of *antiquity* that is to make the authority of each decisive, or more or less approaching to decisive. Everything in short pertaining to this appeal is obscure, uncertain, disputable, and actually disputed, to such a degree, that even those who are not able to read the original authors may yet be perfectly competent to perceive how unstable a foundation they furnish. They can perceive that the mass of Christians are called on to believe and to do what is essential to Christianity, in implicit reliance on the *reports* of their respective pastors, as to what certain deep theological antiquarians have *reported* to them, respecting the *reports* given by certain ancient fathers of the *reports* current in their times, concerning apostolical usages and institutions! And yet whoever departs in any degree from these is to be regarded at best in an intermediate state between Christianity and heathenism! Surely the tendency of this procedure must be to drive the doubting into confirmed, though perhaps secret, infidelity, and to fill with doubts the most sincerely pious, if they are anxiously desirous of obtaining truth, and unhappily have sought it from such instructors.'

Doctor Whately, however, does not content himself with

demolishing the sophistical plea for the authority of the fathers, but enters with honest resolution into the main subject which we have undertaken to discuss, and which it is becoming daily more and more important to settle. The imaginary confederation popularly called 'THE CHURCH,' is utterly shorn of its beams by the following conclusive paragraphs in direct continuation of the passage just cited.

'But an attempt is usually made to silence all such doubts by a reference to the catholic church, or the 'primitive,' or the 'ancient catholic church,' as having authority to decide, and as having in fact decided, on the degree of regard due to the opinions and testimony of individual writers among the fathers. And a mere reference such as this, accompanied with unhesitating assertion, is not unfrequently found to satisfy or silence those who might be disposed to doubt. And while questions are eagerly discussed as to the degree of deference due to the 'decisions of the universal church,' some preliminary questions are often overlooked: such as, when, and where did any one visible community, comprising all Christians as its members, exist? Does it exist still? Is its authority the same as formerly? Where is its central supreme government, such as every single community must have? Who is the accredited organ empowered to pronounce its decrees, in the name of the whole community? And where are these decrees registered?

'Yet many persons are accustomed to talk familiarly of the decisions of the catholic church, as if there were some accessible record of them, such as we have of the acts of any legislative body; and as if there existed some recognised functionaries, regularly authorised to govern and to represent that community, the church of Christ; and answering to the king, senate, or other constituted authorities in any secular community. And yet no shadow of proof can be offered, that the church, in the above sense—the universal church—can possibly give any decision at all; that it has any constituted authorities as the organs by which such decision could be framed or promulgated; or, in short, that there is, or ever was, any *one community on earth* recognised, or having any claim to be recognised, as the universal church, bearing rule over and comprehending all particular churches.

'We are wont to speak of the foundation of the church, the authority of the church, the various characteristics of the church, and the like, as if the church were, originally at least, one society in all respects. From the period in which the gospel was planted beyond the precincts of Judea, this manifestly ceased to be the case; and as Christian societies were formed among people more and more unconnected and dissimilar in character and circumstances, the difficulty of considering the church as one society increases. Still, from the habitual and unreflecting use of this phrase, 'the church,' it is no uncommon case to confound the two notions, and occasionally to speak of the various societies of Christians as *one*, occasionally as distinct bodies. The mischief which has been grafted on this inadvertency in the use of the term, has already been noticed; and it is no singular instance of the enormous

practical results which may be traced to mere ambiguity of expression. The church is undoubtedly *one*, and so is the human race *one*, but not as a *society*. It was, from the first, composed of distinct societies, which were called one, because formed on common principles. It is one society only when considered as to its future existence. The circumstance of its having one common head (Christ,) one Spirit, one Father, are points of unity which no more make the church one society on earth, than the circumstance of all men having the same Creator, and being derived from the same Adam, renders the human race one family. That Scripture often speaks of Christians generally under the term, 'the church,' is true; but if we wish fully to understand the force of the term so applied, we need only to call to mind the frequent analogous use of ordinary historical language, when no such doubt occurs. Take, for example, Thucydides' *History of the Peloponnesian War*. It contains an account of the transactions of two opposed parties, each made up of many distinct communities; on the one side were democracies, on the other oligarchies. Yet precisely the same use is made by the historian of the terms 'the democracy' and 'the oligarchy,' as we find Scripture adopting with regard to the term 'the church.' No one is misled by these, so as to suppose the community of Athens *one* with that of Corcyra, or the Theban with the Lacedæmonian. When the heathen writer speaks of 'the democracy of,' or 'in' the various democratical states, we naturally understand him to mean distinct societies, *formed on similar principles;* and so, doubtless, ought we to interpret the sacred writers when they, in like manner, make mention of the church of, or in Antioch, Rome, Ephesus, Corinth, &c.'—pp. 135—139.

In the absence of any one body which can be regarded even as legislative, much less as possessed of authority to bind succeeding generations, where are we to find the impersonation of that to which certain writers habitually refer as the authority of 'the church?' If we are to seek it in those councils by which the existing order of service as received with few important alterations by the Anglican clergy was constructed, we appeal to those whose authority the said clergy themselves disallow, against whose distinguishing doctrines the articles of the Church of England are avowedly directed, whose errors they stigmatize as heresies, and whose regular ordination they only admit for the sake of legitimizing their own. But even if a body could be admitted to exist, or to have existed, which was competent to express the mind of the Christian church at large, a second and more important inquiry would arise. Whence do they possess that authority which is so reverendly admitted by the large proportion of the established church in this country? No one is wild enough to pretend that it arises from the inspiration of its members, but if they were not inspired they were not infallible; and if they were liable to error, what advantage had they over individual Christians of the present day? Why are their doctrines

to be humbly received, and their errors to be carefully stereotyped? Why are children themselves to be coerced into their communion, before the course of nature allows of their being indoctrinated with their notions? If, in the twilight of civilization, before the human mind was well awakened from the slumber of ages, and while it lay beneath the shadow of the massive ruins of papacy, councils of ecclesiastics, with ambitious potentates at their head, could expound the religion of Christ and regulate its worship, how much of illumination, amounting to comparative infallibility, may not be expected in the present age, when the study of Christian truth has been conducted under all the advantages of learning and genius, and when a wide spread church, in a better and purer sense of that term, supplies the 'multitude of counsellors' with whom is wisdom. It would have been surely enough for such councils to have drawn up a system of doctrine and a code of discipline for the reception of contemporary Christians. To entail them upon posterity was grossly to exceed any powers to which they could possibly pretend. 'Say not,' says the wise man, 'that the former days were better than these.'

But in addition to these considerations, it should be remembered that the Christian religion, from its strictly personal reference, involves the right of private judgment as a fundamental principle; and if this does not lie at the root of protestantism, then, most assuredly, protestantism is based on no principle at all. 'THE BIBLE, AND THE BIBLE ALONE, IS THE RELIGION OF PROTESTANTS,' and the defiance of human dictation in matters of faith and worship constitutes the very spirit of that change which we are taught to call the Reformation. If this principle is to be conceded, we may well say of the illustrious martyrs of protestantism, 'Their preaching was vain, and our faith is also vain.'

It is indeed passing strange that those who talk and write thus loosely about the authority of the church, should never give themselves the trouble to inquire what effect the dogmas of ancient councils, cardinals, or clergy, can possibly exert upon their belief. The spurious authority of such bodies may, indeed, tempt to uniformity of profession, that is, to wide spread and fatal hypocrisy; but, from the nature of the human mind it is evidently as incapable of securing unity of opinion, as it is of regulating the return of comets and the direction of the winds. It is matter for astonishment and humiliation that men should be found in this adult age of the world, adorned with all the trophies of success in learning, and possessed of the combined instructions of enlightened philosophy and true religion, who can, in spite of them all, deliver over themselves and those whom they affect to teach, to the barbarous and utterly absurd principle, that opinion can be coerced by authority, and uniformity of faith, secured by act

of parliament. Nothing can account for it but the fact, which all observation is adapted to teach us, that the most fatal errors of mankind take their rise in the most simple and elemental principles. They diverge from the right line of truth at its origin, where the angle of divergence is so small as to escape the observation of those whose minds are not habituated to the scrutiny of principles; but when carried out to indefinite lengths, they recede from that line at indefinite distances,

> 'As streams
> Which smiling left the mountain's brow,
> As though their waters ne'er would sever;
> Yet, ere they reach the plain below,
> Break into floods that part for ever.'

Upon this necessary independence of the human mind is based as a consequence the independence of Christian churches. It is as consistent with scripture as with reason, that each separate community of faithful men should interpret the doctrines of Christianity for themselves, or, rather that each individual Christian should interpret those doctrines for himself; that the authority of others, whether individuals or councils, should come before them for their judgment and not for their guidance; and that the control and the will of the church should be resolutely disallowed by them, unless indeed, by a prostitution of language, they can be understood to mean the authority of the Bible and the will of God.

Nothing can be imagined more favourable to this perfect freedom and independence, both of churches and individual minds, than the legislative portion of the apostolic writings. This is perhaps more apparent in what is omitted, than in what is enjoined. For while the most distinct rules are laid down as to the principles and doctrines which should distinguish Christian churches, while they specify the ordinances which should be administered within them, and the general functions of their officers, they omit to specify the precise mode and form of such administration, nor do they record even the number of distinct official orders, nor the functions appropriated to *each,* nor the degree and kind of control they should exercise in the churches. Now, when it is recollected that the apostles established churches wherever they introduced the gospel, that in each they appointed elders with a worship to conduct and sacraments to administer, and yet left a total silence reigning over the details of such worship and such administration, it is impossible to doubt that the design of the apostles was to secure the independence of each separate community. 'While,' says Dr. Whately, 'the principles, in short, are clearly recognised, and strongly inculcated, which Christian communities and individual

members of them are to keep in mind and act upon, with a view to the great objects for which these communities were established, the *precise modes* in which these objects are, in each case, to be promoted, are left—one can hardly doubt, studiously left—undefined.'

A second and still more important arrangement for the maintenance of this inviolable independency, was the exclusion of an established order of priesthood. Unhappily, we are not left to conjecture as to what would have been the effect of the opposite regulation. We find it in the history of those churches, which for secular and ambitious purposes have departed from the simplicity of the New Testament, while they invented the chimera of apostolical succession; and that history is one of corrupted doctrine, decayed piety, paralyzed activity, and relaxed morals. Nothing indeed can be conceived more adverse to the simplicity of religion, and more favourable to formality, spurious uniformity, and real, essential schism, than the subjection of religious faith and ecclesiastical discipline, to the dictation of a class of self-chartered and self-consecrated priests.

On this latter point, we have an argument left to us by the late Dr. Arnold in the introduction to his 'Christian Life,' which, as coming from a writer who was himself a clergyman, and one of the brightest ornaments of the communion to which he belonged, deserves our especial attention. 'On two points,' says he, 'points not of detail but of principle, the scripture does seem to speak decisively. First,—The whole body of the church was to take an active share in its concerns; the various faculties of its various members were to perform their several parts; it was to be a living society, not an inert mass of mere hearers and subjects, who were to be authoritatively taught, and absolutely ruled by one small portion of its members. It is quite consistent with this, that, at particular times, the church should centre all its own power and activity in the persons of its rulers. In the field, the imperium of the Roman consul was unlimited; and, even within the city walls, the senate's commission, in times of imminent danger, released him from all restraints of law; the whole power of the state was, for the moment, his, and his only. Such temporary despotisms are sometimes not expedient merely, but necessary; without them society would perish. I do not, therefore, regard Ignatius's epistles as really contradictory to the idea of the church conveyed to us in the twelfth chapter of St. Paul's first epistle to the Corinthians; I believe that the dictatorship, so to speak, which Ignatius claims for the bishop in each church, was required by the circumstances of the case; but to change the temporary into the perpetual dictatorship, was to subvert the Roman constitution; and to make Ignatius's language

the rule, instead of the exception, is no less to subvert the Christian church. Whenever the language of Ignatius is repeated with justice, there the church must either be in its infancy or in its dotage, or in some extraordinary crisis of danger; wherever it is repeated, as of universal application, it destroys, *as in fact it has destroyed*, the very life of Christ's institution.

'But, second, the Christian church was absolutely and entirely, at all times, and in all places, to be without a human priesthood. Despotic government and priesthood are things perfectly distinct from one another. Despotic government might be required from time to time, by this or that portion of the church, as by other societies; for government is essentially changeable, and all forms, in the manifold varieties of the condition of society, are, in their turn, lawful and beneficial. But a priesthood belongs to a matter not so varying—the relations subsisting between God and man. These relations were fixed for the Christian church, from its very foundation, being, in fact, no other than the main truths of the Christian religion; and they bar, for all time, the very notion of an earthly priesthood. They bar it, because they establish the everlasting priesthood of our Lord, which leaves no place for any other; they bar it, because priesthood is essentially mediation, and they establish one Mediator between God and man—the man Christ Jesus.

'And, therefore, the notion of Mr. Newman and his friends, that the sacraments derive their efficacy from the apostolical succession of the ministers, is so extremely unchristian, that it actually deserves to be called antichristian; for there is no point of the priestly office, properly so called, in which the claim of the earthly priest is not absolutely precluded. Do we want him for sacrifice? Nay, there is no place for him at all; for our one atoning sacrifice has been once offered, and by its virtue we are enabled to offer daily our spiritual sacrifices of ourselves, which no other man can by possibility offer for us. Do we want him for intercession? Nay, there is one who ever liveth to make intercession for us, through whom we have access to the Father, and for whose sake, Paul, and Apollos, and Peter, and things present, and things to come, are all ours already. His claim can neither be advanced nor received without high dishonour to our true Priest, and to his blessed gospel. If circumcision could not be practised, as necessary, by a believer in Christ, without its involving a forfeiture of the benefits of Christ's salvation, how much more does St. Paul's language apply to the invention of an earthly priesthood—a priesthood neither after the order of Aaron, nor yet of Melchizedek, unlawful alike under the law and the gospel!

'It is the invention of the human priesthood, which falling in,

unhappily, with the absolute power rightfully vested in the Christian church during the troubles of the second century, fixed the exception as the rule, and so in the end destroyed the church.'

In the most striking contrast to the views we have thus indicated, and which we have fortified by the candid and luminous arguments of Archbishop Whately and Doctor Arnold, stands the recent charge of the Bishop of London.

In one aspect of it we can hardly say it has disappointed us, inasmuch as his lordship's sermons, to which we have already devoted an article, have prepared us for all the priestly and episcopal arrogance which even the pages before us exhibit. But we certainly hardly expected to find in such a production the evidence of so total an absence of the habit, if not of the very power of thinking. Indeed, its intolerable dulness as a composition, is only relieved by the startling character of the errors and absurdities it contains. Its perusal must affect the minds of all who respect the rights of conscience, and the truths of Christianity, rather with sorrow than with anger, and perhaps, rather than either, with a sense of deep, but sympathetic humiliation.

The prominent doctrines on which the bishop insists, are the exclusive validity of the ministry of the established church, the right of the bishop to direct the faith of his clergy, the efficiency of sacraments in general, and baptismal regeneration in particular, dependent on the validity of ordination, the binding obligation of the rubric, and the essential value of outward and conventional forms. In a word, it is the latest exponent of the newly-discovered theological hybrid, denominated Puseyism. To this wild and foolish movement the Bishop of London has virtually and distinctly devoted himself. One would imagine, that having given up all hope of Canterbury, his lordship is addressing himself, as an alternative, to a life of usefulness; and if so, he has made a most auspicious commencement. His charge, what with its concessions and its absurdities, will probably effect a greater amount of good than was ever comprehended in his benevolent intentions. We will notice the more prominent inconsistencies of the Bishop of London's production—*summa papavera carpens*—in the order in which we have referred to them above. And first, with regard to the exclusive authority of the privileged sect, his lordship says, 'I have so recently made public the nature of my opinions on the divine institution and authority of the church, that I need not repeat them on the present occasion. If the view which I have taken be correct, it follows as a necessary inference, that in this country the clergy of the national church, *and they alone*, are entitled to the respect and obedience of the people as their lawful guides and governors in spiritual things.

They alone are duly commissioned to preach the word of God, and to minister his holy sacraments.' The legerdemain in the above passage needs hardly to be pointed out. The only difficulty is to reconcile so palpable a juggle with that integrity for which we would wish to give credit to a man of Dr. Blomfield's loud pretensions. The term 'church,' in the two clauses of the sentence, is used in two different, and not very reconcileable senses, and that without the performer having given us any notice that he was shifting the balls. That THE CHURCH is of divine institution,—meaning the Christian religion, and the organization by which it is to be promoted in the world,—no good man will deny. That the *national church in this country*, with its simony and its patronage, its traffic in advowsons and next presentations, its sinecures, secularities, and corruptions, and '*it alone*' is of divine institution and authority, no rational man will admit. Surely the Bishop of London has not the boldness to affirm that the New Testament regime was identical with that of the Anglican church with a monarch at its head, with its bishops in the senate, with an enormous accumulation of wealth, abstracted from an ancient corporation which it superseded, with power to levy religious taxes by Act of Parliament, with bishops presiding over a multitude of subordinate clergy, to whom they authoritatively dictate their faith, their mode of worship, and even their dress, and whom they can remove from their duties at pleasure; with deans and priests, and canons, and prebends, and precentors—

> 'Embryos and idiots, eremites and friars,
> White, black, and grey, with all their trumpery!'

If such is the chimera of the Bishop of London, let us hear Archbishop Whateley on the same subject. His admirable remarks might almost seem to be a reply by anticipation to the thin and thoughtless effusions of his metropolitan brother.

'But, moreover,' says he, 'not from our own church only, but from the universal church,—from all the privileges and promises of the gospel,—the principles I am condemning, go to exclude, if fairly followed out, the very persons who advocate them. For it is certain that our own institutions and practices are, in several points, not precisely coincident with those of the earliest churches.

'It seems plainly to have been at least the general, if not the universal practice of the apostles, to appoint over each separate *church* a *single* individual as a chief governor, under the title of 'angel' (i.e., *messenger* or *legate* from the apostles) or 'bishop,'—i.e., *superintendent* or overseer.

'A church and a diocese seem to have been for a considerable time *co-extensive* and *identical*. The plan pursued by the apostles seems to have been, as has been above remarked, to establish a greater number of small (in comparison with most modern churches) distinct and

independent communities, each governed by its own single bishop,—consulting, no doubt, with his own presbyters, and accustomed to act in concurrence with them, and occasionally conferring with the brethren in other churches,—but owing no submission to the rulers of any other church, or to any central common authority, except the apostles themselves. And other points of difference might be added.

'Now to vindicate the institutions of our own, or of some other church, on the ground that they 'are not in themselves superstitious or ungodly,' that they are not at variance with gospel principles, or with any divine injunction that was designed to be of universal obligation, is intelligible and reasonable. But to vindicate them on the ground of the exact conformity, which it is notorious they do not possess, to the most ancient models, and even to go beyond this, and condemn all Christians whose institutions and ordinances are not 'one and utterly like' our own, on the ground of their departure from the apostolical precedents, which no church has exactly adhered to, does seem—to use no harsher expression—not a little inconsistent and unreasonable. And yet one may not unfrequently hear members of episcopalian churches pronouncing severe condemnation on those of other communions, and even excluding them from the Christian body, on the ground, not of their not being under the *best* form of ecclesiastical government, but of their wanting the very essentials of a Christian church,—viz., the very same distinct orders in the hierarchy that the apostles appointed: and this, while the episcopalians themselves have universally so far varied from the apostolical institution as to have in one church several *bishops*, each of whom consequently differs in the office he holds, in a most important point, from one of the primitive bishops, as much as the governor of any one of our colonies does from a sovereign prince.

'Now whether the several alterations and departures from the original institutions were or were not, in each instance, made on good grounds, in accordance with an altered state of society, is a question which cannot even be entertained by those who hold that no church is competent to vary at all from the ancient model. Their principle would go to exclude at once from the pale of Christ's church almost every Christian body since the first two or three centuries.

'The edifice they overthrow crushes in its fall the blind champion who has broken its pillars.'

The next point in his lordship's affirmation which calls for notice is, that the 'established clergy alone are entitled to the respect and *obedience* of the people as their lawful guides and *governors* in spiritual things.'* The sole qualification prefixed to

* The reader will not fail to observe the curious law of ecclesiastical precedence implied in this passage. An inspired apostle announces the limits of his powers—'not that we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joy.' A Bishop of London and the tribe of subordinates whose opinions he claims to regulate, 'are alone entitled to the *obedience* of the people as their lawful *governors* in spiritual things!'

this singular position lies in the words, 'in this country,' and the philosophy of it therefore would seem to be, that the Brahmins alone in India, the Budhist priest alone in China, the Mahometan Mufti alone in Turkey, 'are entitled to the respect and obedience of the people' as 'their lawful guides and governors in spiritual things.' Truly, his lordship has invented an invaluable specific for the perpetuation throughout the world of religious differences, and, by consequence, of religious errors. But further, he seems to be as ingenious in creating such differences at home, as in perpetuating them abroad, for the negative form of the proposition obviously implies, that the established clergy are one and all entitled to the obedience of their *respective* spiritual subjects as their legislators in religious matters. Now it is notorious that the widest possible differences of a doctrinal kind exist among the said clergy—that there is not a single form of religious belief or no belief, which is not found within the pale of the parliamentary church. Arians and Socinians, Evangelicals, Calvinists, Arminians, and Puseyites, all herd together on this consecrated common, like the various species of oxen, Scots, Herefords, and Irish, with no outward mark of resemblance, save the brand of the proprietor. On this showing, therefore, the form of belief and worship prevalent in the different parishes of the empire *ought* to be as varied as the caprices and errors of their respective priests.

The Bishop of London may indeed seem to have provided against this universal fortuitousness of doctrine and practice, by modestly vesting in his own order the authority to control the views of the subordinate clergy. 'Being sensible,' says he, in the first sentence of his Charge, 'that I should be expected to speak *with the authority belonging to my office* upon the most important of the questions respecting which the clergy are at present divided in opinion.' Lest any doubt should remain as to the importance of the subject, and the consequent plenitude of his authority, he adds, 'These questions are, in fact, so much more urgent than *any others* which present themselves as suitable topics of an address upon this occasion, that I make no apology for entering upon them at once.'—(Charge, p. 1.) And again, 'It now remains for me to perform the duty of *pronouncing that deliberate judgment* which the clergy of my own diocese are entitled to look for.'—(Charge, p. 2.) It appears then, notwithstanding our noisy boasting of the march of intellect, that we have not yet outlived the grossest follies of the middle ages. For what absurdity was ever held in the thickest night of barbarism more monstrous than that of making *opinion* matter of legislation? of *enacting* theoretic views, and enjoining sentiments with official authority. If his lordship would but for one moment 'take a

thought on men,' surely he would see that his simple authority cannot in any way affect the opinions of those whom he addresses. It may, as we have said before, produce nominal conformity,—that is, wide-spread hypocrisy; but this is not exactly that in which the established clergy are just now deficient. What the church of England wants, is to be saved from those schisms and heresies which are rending it piecemeal, and dividing it into a greater number of hostile sects than were ever known before in the history of the church. To effect this, the Bishop of London's *deliberate judgment* is as impotent as it would be to reverse the seasons, or control the tides.

But even if the magic authority of a bishop could harmonize into unanimity the discordant notions and ignorant errors of a whole diocese, that would, to all appearance, go but little way towards securing to the established church at large uniformity, either of faith or practice. For the creeds professed in Mecca and Madrid are not more diverse than are the religious principles taught by the two contemporary *prelates* whose works are now lying side by side before us. The Bishop of London's manifesto is a defence of the exclusive authority of the parliamentary clergy, of the supremacy of bishops, of the efficacy of sacraments, of apostolical succession and baptismal regeneration; while in the pages of his Grace of Dublin, these particular absurdities form the shuttlecocks which perpetually fly to and fro under the alternate strokes of his reasoning and his ridicule. If, as has been ingeniously suggested, the vulgar word, to *bother*, is derived from the words both-ear, 'hearing the church' through its two metropolitan organs must be a somewhat *bothering* exercise.

With respect to the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, the Bishop of London is sufficiently explicit.

'The opinion,' says he, 'which denies baptismal regeneration, might possibly, though not without great difficulty, be reconciled with the language of the twenty-seventh article; but by no stretch of ingenuity, nor latitude of explanation, can it be brought to agree with the plain unqualified language of the offices for baptism and confirmation. A question may properly be raised as to the sense in which the term regeneration was used in the early church, and by our own reformers; but that regeneration does actually take place in baptism is most undoubtedly the doctrine of the English church; and I do not understand how any clergyman who uses the office for baptism, which he has bound himself to use, and which he cannot alter or mutilate without a breach of good faith, can deny that, in some sense or other, baptism is indeed the laver of regeneration.'—p. 23.

If the doctrine of baptismal regeneration were only repugnant to reason as a gross absurdity, the above paragraph would be less objectionable; but it is truly painful to observe the sanction of

what the Bishop of London calls his 'deliberate judgment,' affixed to the most pernicious and destructive heresy that ever devastated the Christian church—to an error the most fatal, which the Romish church bequeathed to a nominal protestantism, and which has probably done more to ruin the souls of men than can be compensated by all the success which has crowned the ministry of the established church. Its contrariety, however, to the word of God, appears to the Bishop of London a very insufficient reason for disclaiming it. He puts the claims of the church of England high above the authority of the Bible.

Such passages as the following will be perused by every Christian reader with the deepest regret. They appear to us to involve the most offensive and undisguised profanity:—

'To say that my statements respecting the effects of baptism are unscriptural, is altogether beside the purpose. Are they, or are they not in conformity with the teaching of the church? I state that the children of wrath are made in baptism the children of God. It is denied that 'children are brought to the font,' as 'the children of wrath.' But what says the catechism? 'Being by nature born in sin, and the *children of wrath*, we are *hereby* made the children of grace.'—*Appendix to Charge, Note A.*

In a similar spirit the bishop writes—

'You are not to take as your rule and model in this respect the early church, nor the primitive church, but the church of England, as she speaks in plain and obvious cases by her rubric and canons, in doubtful and undecided ones by her bishops.'—pp. 51, 52.

The essential spirit of popery which pervades such passages as these, may well diminish our surprise at finding the most dangerous of all the papal errors, the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, advocated by the Bishop of London.

If, again, it were only one of the puerile vagaries which he pompously puts forth as his 'deliberate judgment,' we might pass it over as an innocuous folly; but, unhappily, if the bishop has proved nothing else, he has at least proved one point, that baptismal regeneration, in the crudest and coarsest form in which it can be enunciated, is a fundamental doctrine of the church of England. It may without unfairness be thus stated,—that the clergy, in right of their ordination by the imposition of the hands of bishops appointed in a direct line of succession from the apostles, have the power, by sprinkling a few drops of water upon the face of a child, entirely to change its nature, to alter all the relations between that child and the supreme Being, to place it at once in a state of salvation, the inevitable attainment of which salvation, under any possible circumstances, is assured in every instance, as directly as language can assure it, in a separate article of the

church; and all this without the remotest reference to the character of the officiary, who may be Christian or infidel, moral or corrupt. It is almost diverting to observe the sly hesitation with which the bishop meets the full force and breadth of this monstrous notion, and the curious subterfuge in which, ostrich-like, he hides his own head. 'A *question* may properly be raised as to the *sense* in which the term regeneration was used in the early church, and by our own Reformers.' Unhappily, the bishop has himself blocked up this avenue of escape. He has taught us to appeal for interpretation from the *articles* to the *offices* of the church; and in the office of baptism, re-affirmed by that of confirmation and the catechism, we find it stated in so many words, that all persons thus baptized are made '*members of Christ, the children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven.*' We should be glad to be informed of any terms which the English language can supply, more fatal to all dispute or misunderstanding than those which are here employed. But what are we to say to the principle next laid down by his lordship. 'Ordinances and ceremonies,' says he, p. 50, 'which cannot be shown to have been *instituted by the apostles with a direction for their continuance*, are not of perpetual obligation upon the whole church.' From this it obviously follows, that they are not of *temporary* obligation, since it is not pretended that any limit was ever fixed by inspiration to the duration of New Testament ordinances; and further, that they are not obligatory on a part only of the church, since it is not pretended that any distinction was ever made as to what sections of the church should adopt the ordinances of the Christian religion. It would then be instructive for the Bishop of London to show when and where the apostles 'instituted with a direction for their continuance, regenerative baptism, confirmation, episcopal ordination, absolution, or even subscription to the thirty-nine articles themselves, unless it was typified in the 'significant ordinance' of 'forty stripes save one.' While searching for apostolical authority for the above, it might also be well for him to bear in mind, with the same view, the 'perpetual obligation' of surplices in morning sermons (p. 54), lights placed on the communion table (p. 48), gowns with standing collars, and cloaks with sleeves (p. 42), the prayers for the ember weeks (p. 65), and the order of service when the saint's day falls on a Sunday, (Ibid.) An object so novel will add additional relish to the exercise of 'searching the Scriptures.'

It is impossible to imagine anything more puerile than the principles which the bishop lays down, and the directions which he gives respecting the most trifling ceremonial observances. His lordship's solemnity is perfectly ludicrous. In pronouncing, for example, on the momentous subject of surplices and gowns,

cloaks, collars, and sleeves, he seems almost overwhelmed with its importance, and consciously inadequate to the task of jurisdiction, owing to the infirmities of our common humanity interfering with the high prerogatives of his apostolic authority. 'Upon the whole,' he says (p. 54), I am hardly prepared to give any positive direction on this point for this particular diocese, although it is certainly desirable that uniformity of practice should prevail in the church at large.' Again, on the solemn subject of candles. The bishop permits their being placed on the communion table, but with a laudable economy, evidently dictated by the straightened circumstances of the church, *forbids their being lighted.* In this prudent regulation his lordship doubtless determines that the wax shall be saved, whatever may become of the communicants. Probably he is following out the example of the learned and excellent Vicar of Wakefield, who permitted his daughters to carry a guinea in their pockets, on condition that it should neither *be spent nor changed!*

Some of the cautions of the Bishop of London are still more diverting.

'I strongly disapprove,' says he (p. 49), 'of the practice which I am informed has been adopted by a few of the clergy of decorating the communion table with flowers, and especially when that decoration is varied from day to day, *so as to have some fanciful analogy to the history of the saint who is commemorated.* This,' he adds, 'appears to me something worse than frivolous, and to approach very nearly to the honours paid by the church of Rome to *deified sinners.*'

Now all this smacks pretty strongly of protestantism. But what do we find in a previous paragraph of the Charge?

'It is my wish, that in obedience to the church's directions, you should celebrate public worship on all the *anniversaries* (!) of these events, on every day in Passion-week, upon the Mondays and Tuesdays after Easter-day and Whit-Sunday, and upon Ash-Wednesday. By specifying these particular days, I do not mean to insinuate that *the other festivals and the fasts of our church are not also to be duly kept!*'—*Charge*, p. 32.

What is a reader of common sense to understand from all this? We presume that the Bishop of London will concede that St. Philip and St. Bartholomew were '*sinners.*' Where then (if any where) lies the charge of '*deifying*' them? Which ceremony approaches the nearer to an apotheosis, that of sticking a bunch of violets into the extinguisher of an altar-candlestick to the memory of St. Barnabas on the day appointed by 'our church' to his honour,—or, labouring through a long tautological service on the occasion, with, peradventure, a sermon from a bishop? Tacitus, in describing the simple funeral obsequies of the ancient

Germans, says, 'Sepulchrum cespes erigit. Monumentorum arduum et operosum honorem, ut gravem defunctis, aspernantur.' How would these ancient worthies have pitied the saints of our *protestant* calendar! *Gravem defunctis* indeed! What if their remains are to be loaded with a pyramidal sermon from the Bishop of London! If his sermons at all resemble his charges, they would give the canonized sufferer a fit of spasms in his grave.

It is impossible within such limits as we are compelled to prescribe for ourselves, to notice as it requires, the whole of the Bishop of London's Charge. To do this effectually, every paragraph in succession, containing as it does some covert error, should be turned inside out. In hastening to a conclusion, we must omit all reference to 'the *rule* laid down in the rubric and the canon, that *every parishioner* should communicate at least thrice a year' (p. 37); to the law respecting 'worshipping towards the East,' as referred to 'by Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian' (p. 46); and to the declaration of his lordship, that he does not 'consider it to be the intention of our church that the officiating minister, when reading prayers, should turn to the East *with his back to the congregation*, (p. 47); from which we are happy to conclude, that the worshippers will *not* be compelled to stand on their heads in the litany, nor to repeat the responses on all fours.

There is but one other statement of the bishop to which we can find space to refer. This occurs at the close of his lordship's address.

> 'In conclusion,' says he, 'reverend brethren, let us be careful to bear in mind ourselves, and to teach our people, that the outward means and aids of religion are not religion itself; *but are so far valuable and useful as they contribute to the great ends of religion, to form Christ within us, to establish the life of God in the soul, and to keep us within the precincts of his grace.*'—p. 66.

We never were more convinced than by the perusal of these lines, that a little truth, like a little knowledge, is a dangerous thing; that in many cases the truth, if it be not the whole truth, is virtually error. It is easy to see what the bishop means by 'the outward means and aids of religion.' This is sufficiently indicated in the foregoing part of his lordship's address. He is evidently referring to those numerous and unmeaning formalities which he is seeking to introduce again into the worship of the church, invested with a degree of importance but little consistent with the spirit of protestantism. To say that these are not religion is not enough; while to attribute to them even a tendency to 'form Christ within us, and to establish the life of God in the soul,' is something worse than a merely negative error. The

truth is, in our deliberate conviction, that they are *hostile* to religion, and in proportion to the reverence with which they are observed, destructive of the 'life of God in the soul,' inasmuch as they favour the tendency, so unhappily pertaining to our nature, to rest in sensible forms, and oppose gratuitous and obtrusive barriers between the mind and the great object and purposes of worship. Hence, nothing is more uniformly condemned by the great Author of the Christian religion, than these pharisaic forms; while the apostle of the Gentiles seems to have had them ever before his notice as subjects of the gravest rebuke and the most poignant satire. We have never heard of such a publication as a 'Reply to the Epistles of Paul;' but, if we may judge from the tenor of the charge before us, the Bishop of London is the most likely man to attempt such a folly.

We need not recur to the work of the Archbishop of Dublin, further than by saying that it furnishes the strongest imaginable contrast to the Bishop of London's charge. It is, throughout, candid, liberal, argumentative, and lucid. It explodes, in a style of conclusiveness almost peculiar to Dr. Whately, the doctrines of apostolical succession, an authoritative priesthood, the innate efficacy of sacraments, the sanctity of places, the subserviency of individual churches to episcopal dictation, the authority of 'the church,' and the powers of bishops as derived from the Bible.

On a general review then of the two productions before us, two inquiries arise which it would be folly to pass over. The first of these we cannot bring forward without some feelings of a very painful kind. We have read with almost unmingled satisfaction the work of the logician of the contemporary established church—the Archbishop of Dublin. Yet amidst all the pleasure which the perusal of his book has inspired, we are perplexed by some inquiries which we know not how to solve. Did Dr. Whately ever swear to observe the rubric, and to pay canonical obedience? Did he ever swear to the thirty-nine articles, especially the twentieth? Did he ever *consecrate* a place of worship? Did he ever consecrate a bishop to functions which he has proved, in the work before us,* to be utterly unscriptural? Did he ever perform the rites of baptism (as it is called) and of confirmation—rites which the Bishop of London has proved, if he has proved nothing else, to be based essentially on the monstrous doctrine of baptismal regeneration? And if so, how are we, in the exercise of the utmost charity, short of insanity, to reconcile the strange discrepancy between the acts of the bishop and the arguments of the man? We confess ourselves utterly at a loss for a reason why any Quaker in Great Britain should

* See 'Kingdom of Christ,' p. 129, *et al.*

not hold the see of Dublin with as much propriety as Dr. Whately.

The second inquiry which this general retrospect suggests to us is, WHAT IS THE USE OF ESTABLISHED CHURCHES? That they cannot secure uniformity of belief is undeniably plain; inasmuch as belief is solely dependent on *evidence*, which, *as institutions*, they obviously do not and cannot present. The utmost that they can possibly effect is a popular belief in their infallibility or learning,—a matter which, however disputable, lies certainly far enough without the sphere of theological discussion. But that they secure uniformity of *profession* appears to be equally far from the truth, since the utmost extremes of opinion on questions purely ecclesiastical seem to be maintained in the works before us, by two of the most eminent prelates of the day. Then, of what use are BISHOPS—with all the entailed nuisances of episcopal revenues and palaces, advowsons, next presentations, and the endless, heart-sickening list of ecclesiastical abominations? What can we conclude the whole to be, but a system for profligating national wealth in premiums for the perpetuation of ignorance and error, in bribes to formality and rewards for hypocrisy? Well might the old diplomatist dismiss his son with the parting exhortation, 'Go now, my son, and see with how little wisdom the world is governed!'

Art. II. 1. *Aristophanes' Acharnenses, Equites, Nubes, Ranæ*, and *Vespæ*. By T. Mitchell, A.M., late Fellow of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge.

2. *Aristophanes' Aves* and *Plutus*. Bythe Rev. Henry Parker Cookesley, Trinity College, Cambridge.

3. *Prose Translations of various Plays of Aristophanes.* (Advertised in the Oxford Herald.)

IF we do not mistake, more than a few of our readers are likely to think that we owe them an apology for devoting any of our pages to the subject of Comedy; and if such readers fully knew what Heathen comedy is, we suspect that their jealousy would grow stronger still. As our sufficient defence, we plead, that the plays of Aristophanes are continually more and more studied in our Universities; a fact which is proved by the titles of the books set at the head of this article. There must be some sterling value in writings, which, in spite of the serious objections at first sight attaching to them, nevertheless win their way; and it ought not to be set down as a paradox of our own, that they are really too instructive to be lost. The wickedness contained in them is too loathsome to be generally dangerous; and

of course, even this yields its instruction to the rumination of a pure mind: yet, so painful is the process of digestion, we do feel very grateful to those who (as far as may be) expurgate the odious matter, and set before our eyes a somewhat cleaner text.* It must at the same time be remembered, that true science is eminently unfastidious. The pleasant and the unpleasant, the good and the evil, fall alike under its cognizance. The fetid liquids which the chemist stirs up, and the half decaying carcass which the anatomist opens, are sufficiently revolting to the organs of sense: now and then an unfortunate medical student even dies by a prick from the dissecting knife: nevertheless, this is not an adequate reason for objecting altogether to researches in these directions.

As we have got upon this not very pleasant part of our subject, which indeed could not be wholly avoided, may we be allowed to enter on some thoughts which it may seem to suggest? There is a sort of cant in which classical scholars are apt to indulge, about the 'beauty and purity' of the Grecian mind, in wilful ignorance perhaps that this subject has two sides. We cannot enter on the large and important question,—What are the great inward principles out of which the old religions of the world sprang? it is enough here to say, that in the nations of Europe *two* principles take the lead, Imagination and Conscience; and that the former entered far more largely into the religion of the Greeks, the latter into that of the old Romans, as probably of the northern nations. When *Conscience* acts with great strength in the religion of half-savage man, the power of Remorse for the most part generates a dark, perhaps a bloody, superstition; yet this, in process of time, is likely to be softened and purified, unless it be cast into iron immoveability by a national establishment. But when, as to so great a degree with the Greeks, *Imagination* dictates the religious belief, in the same degree the tie which connects morality and religion is loosened; and the wild errors of infantine philosophy, becoming sometimes grotesque, often obscene, grow into the substance of the popular creed; which, while less oppressive to the mind, and far more stimulating to genius and to the fine arts, in the very same proportion loses the vitality of the religious principle, and runs into a loathsome decay. Did we not know by manifold experience what a sacred halo is shed around atrocious cruelty and puerile

* Who will weed the Lysistrata for us? It needs it, prodigiously; yet it is a rather valuable play for its Laconian Greek. If we could reach the ear of its editor, be he who he may, we would entreat him not merely to *mutilate* the text unsparingly, but to insert pure and proper words in place of the vile ones, so that the reader may not find out what a service is being performed for him. Those who make much of *copyright* will always have the means of ascertaining the comedian's real vocabulary.

absurdity, when they can plead long establishment and national religion, it might seem unintelligible how the grave, manly, and noble statesmen whom Athens could boast, passively endured the outrageous indecencies of many public religious performances. Religion having become a matter of taste, rather than of conscience, had, in many of its developments, much 'beauty;' and in pure minds, it might have no small 'purity;' but its effect on the mass of men was decidedly and steadily of the most opposite kind, until the interior of life became infected with foulness so dreadful, as not to be exterminated even by the spread of Christianity. The air remained pestilential, until purified by a flood from the north, and by a fiery tempest from the south; when, after a lengthened quarantine, southern Europe recovered doubtfully from the horrid taint.

The word '*Comedy*,' might be translated, *the song of revellers:* as understood by the English, it imperfectly describes the character of Aristophanes' compositions. They include in fact the different elements of the Farce, the Pantomime, and the Mock Tragedy; with those of the political pamphlet, now and then, over and above. With us, both Tragedy and Comedy represent scenes of reality. The former selects from life the elevated, the beautiful, and the pathetic; the latter draws from the events of every day, and descends into much that is homely and humorous; but both abound with the greatest possible variety of human character, and strive to paint the world of men as it is. Tragedy in Greece had not actually reached this stage, but was rapidly tending towards it, when original genius in poetry died with the empire and liberties of Athens. The speakers of the great tragedian Æschylus are gods or heroes; and in them, according to Aristotle, variety of character is little to be expected; all heroes are alike, and all gods were to be described according to rule. In Euripides, to a very great extent, real men and women of his own day are brought forward; yet the stale old legends which were the sole staple of the tragedian, tied him miserably down to a fixed system. How strange it seems, that the noble drama of the Persians—the only historical play of antiquity—in which the poet Æschylus celebrates the glorious victories of his contemporaries over the invading host of Xerxes, did not excite the genius of his successors to similar worthy subjects! The progress of comedy was in so close an analogy with that of tragedy, as to make it probable that this is the order of nature; a probability which mounts almost into certainty by the similar history of the European drama. For the old comedy, of which the only extant specimens are from Aristophanes, abounded with fictions as wild as those of the Prometheus of Æschylus, or of any modern pantomime. For example, in the play called *The Peace*, an Athenian

who is disgusted with the Peloponnesian war, hits on the following method of terminating it:—He feeds *a beetle* in his stable, (a representative of the winged horse Pegasus!) on which he flies up to Jupiter, &c. &c. What Athenian comedy became under Menander, can be learned with considerable accuracy from his close imitator, the Latin Terence. In him we find a much nearer resemblance to the English idea of comedy, yet there is a great sameness in the structure of the plots, and as for the characters, they are, with few exceptions, in stereotype. Nothing more would be needed to show the meagreness of the art, than the feeble precepts by which Horace recommends the Pisones to aim at *some* variety of persons.

> 'Nec sic enitor tragico differre colori,
> Ut nihil intersit, Davusne loquatur et audax
> Pythias, emuncto lucrata Simone talentum,
> An custos famulusque dei Silenus alumni.'

In tragedy, however, and in comedy, the change, we see, was in the same direction. So likewise in the middle ages, the drama first rose out of religion, with representations of Scriptural subjects. These, treated seriously, constituted our primitive tragedy; and when burlesqued, (a sort of profanity strangely countenanced on certain days by the ecclesiastics,) they became primitive Farce; in strict analogy with the drama of Greece. Their after-history was also similar, except that both branches have in modern Europe reached a development which they never attained in Athens. Their influence, however, has not in England been spread with any sort of equality through different classes of our population. To future historians, the plays which have been tolerated or applauded among us, will prove a valuable index to the state of morals in the play-going part of the community; but there are obvious reasons which, in our case, limit the inferences to be drawn from any of these facts.

In mocking his contemporary tragedian, Euripides, the comic poet before us is extremely happy. In fact, although he follows him up with a spite which strongly implies personal hatred, he is so deeply indebted to him, that we may almost venture to say,—Had not Euripides lived, Aristophanes would not now live for us. A few very good imitations of Æschylus are also found; though in truth, to turn the sublime to the ludicrous, is a very easy problem to the smallest wits. Lucian, among the ancients, has essayed the same thing in his extant tragi-comedy on the goddess *Gout;* and the unknown author of the Battle of the Frogs and the Mice, has similarly travestied the Iliad. The two last writers, however, have sustained the burlesque in a single unvaried note through the whole piece; which, however ingenious,

is certainly rather tiresome. Aristophanes, though far less perfect and laboured as an imitator, is for that very reason more effective. He is what the 'merry mockbird' is described to be, who has a pleasant wild note of his own, but is perpetually surprising us by the intermixture of numberless other well-known cries or strains. His farcical conceptions fully equal anything in modern pantomimes. We have already alluded to the worthy Athenian who flies up to Jupiter on the back of a beetle; but in fact the plot in most of his plays is conceived in the same extravagant spirit. In the 'Wasps,' the old father who is shut up by his son, issues through chinks, crannies, and chimney-holes, with a facility of motion that exceeds a modern harlequin or clown. In the 'Frogs,' the poet introduces the extraordinary idea, that when, on the death of Euripides, Bacchus goes down to the infernal regions to bring up a poet laureat, the slave of Bacchus tries to bargain with a *corpse*, which is just going down thither also, to carry his master's bed-quilts for him. The dead man, however, asks too much, and finally bids his bearers to go on, and carry him to the funeral pile. Most of this, it will be perceived, is a kind of wit addressed to the lowest of the populace; and the same may be said of almost all his attempts at jocosity. In fact, as it is easy for an unprincipled man in unsettled times to gain the reputation of talents far beyond what he possesses, by using unscrupulously all weapons within his reach; so, we apprehend, it is no hard matter to produce jests and witticisms innumerable, if such licence be allowed as Aristophanes gives himself. Many of his elaborate scenes are the mere working out into drama of some single idea, fit barely to serve as the basis of a modern *caricature*. For instance, the lawsuit of the two dogs, who are meant to represent Cleon and Laches, is exactly such a joke as might proceed from the pencil of Cruikshank or of H. B. Our own personal remembrances of pantomime and farce carry us back to so juvenile an age, as to render us diffident of judging; else, we are disposed to say that the off-hand sallies of wit in which Munden and Lister excelled, far surpass the best humour of Aristophanes. His puns are generally of the meanest kind; and to us they have only one interest, viz., that they occasionally throw light on the pronunciation of Greek. His commonest jest, which would indeed be good if it were not repeated *ad nauseam*, is that of surprising the hearer by an unexpected word, a trick which has been exemplified by the following version of a line in Shakspere:—

> 'All the world's a stage,
> And all the men and women are but—passengers.'

But although only a small part of the humour and jocosity in Aristophanes possessed intellectual merit of a high order, its ex-

traordinary abundance is certainly striking; and a general survey of all his remaining works leave on the mind an impression, that he was a versatile genius who might have excelled in a higher and purer line. As it was, he prostituted his talents in the most shameful and shameless way, to please the vilest tastes of the vilest of the mob; not one of whom could possibly have outdone him in coarse and foul invective. But, with Scipio and Lælius habitually for his audience, he might have become as superior to Terence, as Pindar to Horace.

To judge of his powers of *travestie*, in comparison with those of modern authors, needs a larger acquaintance with comic and light literature than we (personally) possess. Of recent popular poets, however, we may be allowed to compare and contrast him with Moore. In broad and avowed burlesque, we think that Moore easily equals him. The peculiar skill of Aristophanes is seen in keeping so on the borders of the serious and the laughing, that the hearer cannot tell how to feel, but is kept in a clever and humorous suspense, alternately awed and tickled by the solemn chant. The following essay at translating the opening address of the chorus in the clouds, may give a conception of his style, in spite of its wanting the charm of rhyme, which would be an ornament not too much to compensate for the loss of the Greek metres. The clouds themselves are the choir, and assume human form at the end of the song.

'Ever-streaming Clouds!
Lift we to view our dewy brilliancy,
From our Sire, deep-roaring Ocean,
Up to the leaf-hair'd summits
Of the high-towering hills:
Whence dart we the far-glancing survey
O'er sacred Earth and her well-water'd crops,
O'er the divine tumultuous rivers,
And o'er the heaving-deeply-groaning Sea.
For the Ether's restless eye is flashing
With quick-sparkling blaze.
Then, shaking off the dripping mist,
Contemplate we Eternal Forms
With wide Earth-viewing eye.'

There is here a delicate exaggeration which keeps increasing as they sing, until at length the mockery is clear. We need hardly add, that imitations of this nature are appreciated with difficulty by foreigners, and that much of its merit is perhaps necessarily lost upon us. The closing words of the passage which we have quoted, are no doubt intended to ridicule the Socratic speculations respecting eternal beauty and truth.

This remark leads us to another side of Aristophanes' character, which throws a new light on his hatred of Euripides; we mean

his ignorant and splenetic misrepresentation of the noble-minded Socrates. It is curious that we have here a close analogy to Mr. Moore's flagrant misunderstanding of the motives and character of those whom he attacks as 'saints.' For Aristophanes to appreciate Socrates, was perhaps as impossible as for Mr. Moore to avoid maligning the prominent 'evangelicals' of the day. Political opposition and personal want of sympathy may have first driven the parties far asunder; every fault is then seen through a magnifying medium, and all that is ambiguous is interpreted for the worse; their religious or speculative opinions are reported piece-meal, and are listened to with greedy contempt, until it becomes an axiom to the mind, that the man who would be more religious than his neighbours is a *charlatan*, deserving merciless and unscrupulous ridicule. Such a mistake is too ordinary in men who have no depth of spiritual feeling to excite surprise; and this is perhaps a sufficient account of Aristophanes' misrepresentation of Socrates. We do not impute it to him as wilful malice; but it seems clearly to prove that he was warped by a deeply seated vulgar and ignorant prejudice, overspreading his whole judgment of the times; that he saw the outside of character, so far as to jest and scoff, but was careless to know the interior; in short, it is abundantly plain, that the comedian was as little able, by his conceptions of science, morals, and education, to elevate the intellect of his countrymen, as he was to purify their imaginations. It would be needless to make this remark at all, were there not a school among us, who, for the sake of vilifying democracy, actually hold up Aristophanes as a grave political, not to say moral, instructor. Unhappily, in England, everything is turned to the purpose of party. Mr. Mitford was the first to show how Greek history might be corrupted for this purpose, and taught his Tory pupils to rejoice in seeing the memory of Socrates trodden under the feet of Aristophanes. We fear that the zeal with which Mr. Mitchell has applied himself to the elucidation of this comedian, is in no small degree ascribable to the same evil principle: for his notes overflow with racy exaggeration of the horrid effects of democracy as exhibited in these compositions. On this point we shall presently dilate. Undoubtedly the true value of Aristophanes to us, is found in the familiar development of social feeling and habits, and the innumerable allusions to laws and customs which come out unexpectedly; besides the reference to passing political events. Indeed, the voluminous Scholia by which the author is illustrated, are often at least as valuable as the original text. But in order to turn such materials to the service of true, impartial history, some power of digestion is needed. Much that is extravagant must be pared down; far more than usual allowance must be made for the pre-

judices both of author and of audience; and as the object of both parties most clearly was, *to make fun*, it is grossly absurd to deal with his statements as serious fact. How much of the serious and the real lay beneath, is a question for delicate research; and our conclusions need to be checked by the information derived from other sources. Our complaint, however, against Mr. Mitchell is less on the head* of direct credulous inference, than on that of disingenuous suppression. Disingenuous is perhaps a strong word; nor do we mean to impute conscious unfairness. It is, however, an unfairness which ought to be visited as a serious offence on a writer of his extensive erudition. He tells his simple reader of the iniquities, cruelties, and follies of the democratic Athenians, and bids them to believe that this nails the condemnation of democratic constitutions. But is he ignorant, *can* he be ignorant, that the enormities of the aristocratic states were often yet worse? Considering how systematically Mr. Mitchell sets himself to the work of disparaging and vilifying the Athenian people and their form of government, and how he elaborates into gall, for poisoning his arrows, what Aristophanes meant as spice and seasoning for his jokes, we do not feel that it is at all out of place to enter more closely into this subject.

In the early period of the French Revolution, when so many sanguine minds fondly thought that democracy was a sure remedy against despotism, it may have been allowable to set forth with more than usual keenness the instructive fact, that a mob-tyrant, a sovereign-many, may be as capricious, as savage, as unbearable a monster, as any two-legged despot. This is, in fact, the best apology which can be made for Mitford's aberrations. The historian himself, moreover, was probably panic-struck by the awful scenes which Paris soon witnessed; and his nerves may never have recovered the shock. But to what good end does Mr. Mitchell, in the bosom of an aristocratic community, display perpetually to the sons of the rich the tyranny, selfishness, meanness, cruelty, falsehood, and universal knavery of a sovereign mob? And why do we never hear from him a word about the perfidious atrocity of aristocracies? If by avoiding democracy, we can obtain justice, truth, peace, and purity, truly it is a simple matter enough to provide for the good government and order of nations. But it ought not to need much historical research to teach us that Mr. Carlyle's problem is insoluble: 'Given a world

* He has a singularly ominous remark, about its seeming as if it were common with the Athenians *to strangle their fathers*, which he declares he will not venture positively to deduce from Aristophanes' imputations! May we venture to suggest to him, that if this crime was ever perpetrated, it was probably by the son of a rich, perhaps a noble, father.

of rogues, to construct a good constitution.' If the internal moral state of a nation is bad, neither aristocracy nor democracy nor monarchy can be good in it. In a free representation of such a people, their *vices* of course will be represented; while, if the power be lodged with a part only, that part will indulge its characteristic evil propensities. Now it is not at all true that the Athenian people were politically worse than other nations of Greece, or of antiquity; nor yet, that the lower orders among them were more corrupt or wicked than their highest classes. As to the first point, it is fair to compare them only with such nations as were similarly tempted by the possession of power. The Acarnanians and the Achæans in Greece Proper, the Rhodians on the coast of Asia, enjoy a high reputation for justice and goodness; nor would we say a word to disparage them. It was *their* precious advantage never to have become too powerful; but the eminent virtue of Athens raised her too rapidly, winged her to a pinnacle of glory, where she became dizzy and drunk; and finally, in order to uphold her unjust sway, her great statesman plunged her into a war, which brought about an inward demoralization. Compare her, however, with Sparta, Thebes, and Macedon, the states which successively supplanted her power, and she will not appear to disadvantage. It may deserve remark, that these are four different races of Greeks: Ionians, Dorians, Æolians, and Macedonians. As for Sparta, the intense selfishness which guided all her counsels was previously so plain, as to be pointed at most distinctly by the great historian of the Peloponnesian war. On the overthrow of Athens, Sparta in half a dozen years made herself as much hated, as Athens had ever been feared; and when her power culminated, she showed, by her conduct to Thebes, to what lengths of perfidy she was prepared coolly to go. In short, a Spartan garrison, a Spartan governor, were, upon an allied state, a yoke of slavery far more unendurable than the restlessness of Athenian ambition.—Thebes, when her brief day of power came, had the inestimable advantage of a statesman and general—Epaminondas—possessing to an extraordinary degree the public confidence, and endowed with moral qualities and a philosophic culture, to which all succeeding time has paid homage. Notwithstanding this, the Thebans became hated, almost as rapidly as had the Spartans: and when by the sudden gathering of the half-robber army of the Phocians, armed and fed from the plunder of the temple of Delphi, the tide of Theban prosperity had once been checked; its spring was dried up, and it rose no more at all: not because the armies of Thebes were less valiant or worse trained, but because she had shown utter unfitness to be trusted as a leader of Greece. As for Macedonia, *if* its hereditary kings could have been spared;

—*if* the splendid absurdity of conquering the East had not drawn away from Greece their nobler minds and brilliant talents; —*if* Philip, desiring as he did to be the acknowledged head and monarch of free Greeks, had not fallen by the dagger of an assassin;—*if* Alexander could have thought the field upon which he was born, large enough to be worthy of him;—undoubtedly that royal race might have united Hellas into a single nation, under happier auspices than could previously have been hoped for. But we are trifling: for what is this, but to say,—*if* kings could have victorious armies and not desire to employ them;—*if* youthful monarchs could bear to have their will resisted by freemen, and not flame out into a destruction of freedom; *then*, great benefits would follow. The FACT is this: the able and accomplished Philip chose, like other despots, 'to multiply wives to himself,' and his life fell a sacrifice to female jealousy and intrigue:—the general truth is certain, though the details are doubtful. The young Alexander razed Thebes to the ground, and sold her population into slavery, with as little remorse as his father had felt towards Olynthus, or the Athenians towards Scione; afterwards, by the loss of his single life, which he exposed every day as though it had been worthless or immortal, the whole Persian empire, as well as Greece, became the prize set up for soldiers of fortune. During their struggles, bloodshed and crime in every form was at least as common as in former days, but it had no longer the pretence of zeal for the public freedom and welfare; no higher principle of patriotism could be called out by deeds of daring, and as far as the regal power of Macedonia reached, a hopeless tyranny was established, under which the energy and genius of Greece rapidly crumbled away. In the retrospect, we fearlessly ask, whether Sparta, Thebes, or Macedon, have anything to boast over Athens, in respect to their use of power?

In contrast to Sparta, the state with whom it is most natural to compare her, Athens has a very decided advantage. Mr. Mitchell would fain persuade us that the Athenian people behaved toward their dependents with peculiar atrocity: but what fact in their history makes any approach to the massacre of the brave and innocent Helots, which the Spartans planned and perpetrated in cold blood? Hear the story as told by the impartial and sage Thucydides, while suffering under the 'ignorant impatience' of a democracy.

'The Spartans were likewise desirous of some pretence for sending many of the Helots abroad. In fact, in dread of their perversity and their numbers, they had even done the following deed. They gave out, that as many of them as imagined themselves to be able warriors, might come forward to be examined and to receive the prize of free-

dom. This, however, was meant to try them, as they thought that just those would accept the challenge, who from high spirit would be most likely to attack them. After selecting as many as two thousand of them, they placed garlands on their heads, and led them about the temples, as if to set them free; and then soon after made away with them, and no one knew in what manner they were every one destroyed.' —*Thuc.* iv. 80.

Mr. Mitchell labours through the whole of one play, 'The Wasps,' to convince us, by reasoning, by assertion, or by insinuation, of the flagrant venality of Athenian juries. But what Greek ever expected honourable impartiality from a Spartan jury? and what Greek commanders were so notoriously fond of gold as those of Sparta? what Athenian jury ever so perjured itself for money, as did the senatorial and knightly tribunals of Rome for ninety years together? And as for the absolute fact, we cannot but think that Mr. Mitchell extremely overrates the amount of Athenian corruption. We extract the following passage from Diodorus, a writer by no means anxious to hide the faults of the Athenian populace:—

'The Athenians, on hearing [the danger of the Messenians at Pylos] sent out thirty ships to help the besieged, under the command of Anytus, son of Anthemion. This man, after getting out to sea, from bad weather was unable to double Cape Malea, and so sailed back to Athens. Hereby the people was enraged, suspecting it was treachery in him; accordingly, he was impeached. Anytus then, coming into extreme danger, rescued his life by money, and *seems to have been the first Athenian who ever corrupted a jury by bribes.*'—*Diodor.* 13, 64.

The event here narrated belongs to the closing years of the Peloponnesian war, and certainly implies, that as yet there could have been no very habitual and deliberate sale of injustice. Indeed, it is credible that many an honest Athenian, who would have been shocked at taking a bribe for doing injury, may have felt no compunction at accepting this compromise from a political offender such as Anytus was supposed to be. We must say that we see nothing in 'The Wasps' to justify Mr. Mitchell's imputations. That comedy exhibits a citizen,—whose son is a rich man, and grieves over his father's monomania,—wedded to the courts of law, not so much for livelihood as by a sort of fanatical passion. The character is alike probable and ludicrous, and very fit it was to make an Athenian audience roar with delight. We really cannot see any of the serious danger to which the comedian exposed himself, nor any signs of the hard struggle of genius and patriotism against prudence, which Mr. Mitchell invents. The poet, no doubt, justly ascribes to all assiduous jurors a tendency to extreme severity: but this was not occasioned by the

abominable policy to which Mr. Mitchell imputes it,—a deliberate plan to encourage false informers, and make work for the jury. On the contrary, it was the fruit of ignorance or passion. Mr. Dickens has recently remarked on the overstrained suspicion of all public men into which the North American democracy falls: the same principle was at work among the Athenians. Poor men cannot estimate either the virtues or the temptations of the higher classes; and as English justices of the peace are naturally severe on the poor, so was an Athenian jury on the rich: indeed, to a great extent, men of narrow experience in life mistake cruel severity for strict and upright justice. That in Athens, the decisions of juries were ordinarily swayed more by passion than by interest, we learn from the remark of Aristotle, that when several public offenders were tried in succession, the first was always treated most severely. Those who came later, escaped easily; as anger was satiated by the punishment of the first. Yet these are the very cases in which bribery would imply least demoralization in those who gave and those who took; and in which the persons exposed to danger, as well as all their friends, would be most lavish in their attempts to corrupt the judgment. Nevertheless, we are far from pretending, that after the Peloponnesian war juries remained immaculate.

Let us, however, ask the opinion of Thucydides, whether the aristocracy of Athens were likely to afford fairer tribunals. By the mouth of Phrynichus, whose political sagacity in the transactions he is relating the historian highly panegyrizes, we learn his positive opinion:—

'As to those who were called the gentry, he well knew that they would cause quite as much vexation to the subject-states as did the commonalty; for it was they who invented evil measures, from which they hoped for personal advantage, and persuaded the people to adopt them. When placed at the mercy of the gentry, the allies would be put to death without trial, and with greater violence; but the people was a refuge for the allies, and a curb on the gentry. And he was perfectly assured that the cities knew this from trial already, and judged thus for the future.'—*Thucyd.* viii. 48.

Once more, let us appeal to a few broad facts. In the later, as well as in the earliest times of Greece, Attica was the favourite abode of numerous foreigners, permanent exiles from their own lands. This could not have been, had not her general treatment of strangers been mild and equitable, in comparison with most other states. Again: many as were the alarms of aristocratic conspiracies in Athens—alarms which facts proved to be too truly founded, in spite of the scorn which Mitford and his followers cast upon them—yet no cruel measures of precaution

against the rich and the noble were adopted by the Athenian democracy. No sooner, however, did the conspirators move, than the secret dagger was employed to terrify every opponent. Nor was this any new or remarkable fact: the assassin and the aristocrat used to be familiar fellow-workers.* Shortly after, the same wicked policy devised and executed a plot for putting to death the brave and innocent generals who had gained the great battle of Arginusæ, whose offence consisted in having dared to win a battle which appeared to make the cause of oligarchy hopeless. The plot was this. The turbulent *Radical* Hyperbolus had been assassinated by the aristocrats, and a sham or *Tory Radical* Archedemus was set up by them in his place. This man, affecting to play the part of the thorough-going democrat, artfully stirred up the passions of the foolish people, and beguiled them into a sentence of condemnation, at which they immediately after, but too late, shuddered. This fatal deed of guilt disorganized the Athenian armies, and presently gave their navy over, an unresisting prey, to the Spartan admiral. When aristocracy had thus triumphed, the 'thirty tyrants' who were put round the neck of Athens, shed in eight months more Athenian blood than the Peloponnesians in ten years of war. They did worse. They got up a massacre of three hundred innocent citizens of good condition, for the mere sake of forcing the infantry and cavalry, who executed the deed, into common guilt, imagining that in this way they should secure their fidelity. But when all failed, and their atrocity recoiled on their own heads—when the exiles swelled into an army, and democracy once more triumphed, the celebrated name of *Amnesty* was invented by the conquerors. Even those who had been most eminent in guilt were allowed to live unmolested at Eleusis, within Attic territory, though forbidden to return to Athens: the total number thus excepted being less than fifty. All others received unconditional pardon, which was fulfilled with such a degree of faith-

* Not having room to justify our remark, we give two passages from Arnold's Rome as vouchers. Vol. i. p. 172:—'The secrecy and treachery of assassination are always terrifying to a popular party, who have neither the organization among themselves to be able to concert reprisals, nor wealth enough to bribe an assassin, even if no better feeling restrained them from seeking such aid. Besides, the burghers were not satisfied with a single murder: others whom they dreaded were put out of the way by the same means as Genucius; and like the Athenian aristocratical conspirators in the Peloponnesian war, they freely used the assassin's dagger to secure their ascendancy.'

So p. 240:—'The burghers of the third and fourth centuries [of Rome], thought it no dishonour that their own daggers, or those of their faithful clients, should have punished with death the insolence and turbulence of the most obstinate of the commons,' &c. &c.

fulness, that the aristocratical historian, Xenophon, writing many years later, declares, 'even till now the people abide by their oath.' Now such being the outline of facts, we do say it is an injustice not to be palliated, when a Greek scholar of no common erudition holds up the Athenian democracy as eminently profligate in Greece.

The unfairness is made only worse, by the evils imputed having a nucleus of fact. The statements of Mr. Mitchell have just enough truth to give them currency and sting; yet they are not the less a falsification of history. For illustration, we shall confine ourselves to the play of 'The Wasps,' since we have already spoken about the law-courts. In his Preface, p. vi., he says, 'The real power of the Athenian *Demus*, as he himself well knew, lay in the courts of law. There was his throne, there his sceptre, &c. &c. A god in some sense he was; for to no earthly tribunal lay there an appeal from him; his person was irresponsible, his decrees irreversible; and if ever there was a despotism complete in itself, 'pure, unsophisticated, dephlegmated, defœcated' despotism, it was that of an Athenian court of judicature.' We pass over the absurdity of complaining that there was no appeal from the sentence of the court, as though it were possible to avoid having *some* court from which there is no appeal, and of complaining that the members of the court were not punishable for their decision, as though the Peers of England were punishable for their votes when called on to decide an appeal. We wish, however, to remark, that there is a truth in the statement, that the Athenian democracy was a true despotism, and moreover, *that its judicial functions were essential to maintaining it.* This is, in fact, a sentiment familiar to the Attic orators when engaged in a criminal prosecution; but not in the sense which Mr. Mitchell puts on it, that the commons deliberately condemned innocent men, as a method of upholding a tyranny. It means this; that the officials will abuse their authority for private ends, and employ the public purse and the public arms as ambition or caprice may dictate, unless they are liable to be impeached and sentenced for their misdeeds.

So too, in fact, it is represented by Aristophanes in this very play: 'The turn of Laches' (says the chorus) 'shall come next, for they say he has found a hive of wealth' in his Sicilian command. Moreover, the institution itself of the great court of Heliæa, for the express purpose of punishing malversations in office and violations of the constitution, was of no late and corrupt origin. It was deliberately devised by the mild and sagacious Solon as an essential organ of his well-balanced polity.

Not satisfied with his own misrepresentations, Mr. Mitchell thinks it necessary to reproduce those of Mitford, whom he

calls, p. 112, 'a severe, but, as becomes a man handling the sacred duties of an historian, a just and impartial judge.' 'No mild law,' says Mitford, 'no common precaution could give security to a constitution like the Athenian. The law of treason, accordingly, at Athens, was conceived in the highest spirit of despotism; *it was atrocious.*' [Italics in Mr. Mitchell.] The law referred to is that which sanctions and rewards the assassination of those who aid in overturning the democracy—a law, shocking, no doubt, to our better feelings. But does Mr. Mitchell not know that, according to Andocides, it was originally enacted by Solon, that the principle was approved of in a practical case by Epaminondas, and that the aristocratic Cicero, as well as the inflexibly conscientious Cato, cordially applauded it?

Does he imagine that Athens was in this respect an exception in Greece? Is he ignorant that Timoleon's murder of his brother was generally approved? Does he wish to imply that aristocrats had *greater* qualms of conscience about using the dagger against those who had violated no law, than democrats against those who were guilty of treason to the constitution? Does he dare to pretend that the Spartan constitution was milder than that of Athens, and that the supremacy of its aristocratic families over the disfranchised freemen and the slaves was kept up by milder methods? Lastly, can he quote any case in which democratic Athenians, or Romans either, used the dagger, even against a tyrant? we think not. Such plots generally proceeded from, were executed by, and were applauded by, the *aristocracy;* though, of course, retaliation was sometimes practised, as by Pelopidas at Thebes.

But the licence of misrepresentation is carried still further by Mr. Mitchell in the following passage (pp. 2, 3), in which we cannot tell whether it is the Athenian *race* under all forms of government, or the Athenian *democracy* which he means to attack. He says:—

'What more deserves attention than an extract detailing the system on which the religious education of the higher class of females was conducted? At seven years old, it appears from the Lysistrata of Aristophanes, a young lady was capable of bearing a part in the splendid processions of her country, &c. . . . At ten years old, she officiated as *grinder of meal* to that goddess (Minerva.) A little further advancement in years qualified her to assume the sacred saffron robe, and enact the part of *a bear* at the festival of Brauron, while full maidenhood qualified her to become one of those religious processionists, on whom the ancient statuaries were accustomed to lavish all the splendours of their art. 'And owe I not a debt to my country,' intimates the female chorus, 'for this noble course of education, and is it not incumbent on me to give the state good and

useful counsels in her emergencies?' Modern reasoners will doubtless take a different view of this course of education. With so little done to effect that surest safeguard of a nation's morals, the mental culture and general respectability of the female character, they will feel little wonder at the general state of manners in Athens, and still less at the means, as licentious as witty, by which this very play endeavours to effect a purpose highly honourable in itself. As to the 'good and useful counsels,' those who know how rapidly the incipient ideas of revolutionists gather strength, will not be surprised to find these reflections of the *religious* chorus end in such measures of reform, as even modern radicalism has not yet ventured on.'

We really read this passage with amazement. We are surprised that the writer can risk exposing himself to the scoffs and laughter which its affectation and absurdity so richly deserve. Nevertheless, we shall treat of it seriously. The comedian represents a lady detailing the honourable part assigned her in religious processions, and that in return for the favour, she ought to give the city good advice: in this, our commentator finds a mare's nest about *religious education, national morality, female character,* &c. That it was in those days a religious act for young women to walk in sacred processions we all know: that it had any immoral tendency does not appear: but if it had, this was not worse in Athens, than in Thebes or Corinth, in Greece than in Italy, where it was equally a religious rite. But when Mr. Mitchell proceeds to connect the 'religious education' of Athenian women with a revolutionary plot invented by the obscene imagination of his favourite comedian, he exhausts our patience, and we turn away from him wearied. As to the matter of fact, it is well known that Ionian women, like those of modern Portugal and Spain, had less liberty than among the Dorians, Romans, or German nations, and their minds but little cultivated. This must have been a great injury to the character of the male part of the nation. Nevertheless, the discerning, impartial, and widely informed Aristotle, seems to have preferred the culture of females at Athens to that which existed at Sparta: for when treating on the happiness of nations, he remarks that we must not leave women out of the question; 'for where the state of the females is bad, as with the Lacedæmonians, the people is scarcely half happy.' (Rhetoric I., pp. 5, 6.) Yet in Lacedæmon, women had greater liberties and rights than in Athens. We look on it as gratuitous insult, to imply that at Athens there was no 'general respectability of the female character:' it ought to have been said by Euripides, not by Mr. Mitchell. Euripides, however, after all, is not so unjust. We wonder whether Mr. Mitchell will ratify the statement put into the mouth of Phædra by Euripides,—that dissolute conduct in women began first in

noble families! But, to leave such bantering, we would ask whether the women of Corinth, or of Lesbos, or of any Asiatic communities in the same stage of advancement, had more 'general respectability' than those of Athens; whether the masculine and revengeful perfidy of the royal females of Macedon, or the easy profligacy found in those of the declining Roman republic, is to be preferred to that virtue which Pericles holds up as the highest praise of his countrywomen,—'the being talked of as little as possible among men.' If we wished to vex our readers by twaddle about the 'religious education' of Spartan women, the verses of Euripides, which describe their palæstra and races, would give us a stinging text.

In a clever, though we will not say a judicious, critique which appeared some years back in a Conservative journal, Aristophanes was held up as a virtuous reformer of his depraved countrymen, who in successive plays endeavoured to drive out some crying vice or evil. The 'Acharnians' (it was said) was directed to reform *the foreign policy* of Athens, the 'Knights' to repress *the demagogues*, the 'Clouds' to protest against the new *national education*, the 'Wasps' to expose *the courts of justice*, the 'Birds' *the tyranny over the allies*, the 'Lysistrata' and 'Ecclesiazusæ' *the state of female society*, the 'Frogs' *the corrupt taste of the day*. All this has barely enough covering of truth to hide its shame. We will venture to give our own account of the comedian's objects in contrast. The 'Acharnians,' like the 'Peace,' which followed it four years later, was written with a directly political object—and a good object, there is no question—to induce his countrymen to terminate the war; but the ends held up to be gained by peace, are gluttony and sensuality, depicted in colours too gross and too glaring to bear any light to be shed on them. The evils of war are inculcated by arguments which could not be listened to seriously by any one without becoming cowardly and base, while the wounds and death of a brave warrior are treated with heartless ridicule. 'The Knights' is a fierce attack on the demagogue Cleon, who was then in the height of pride and power, after his success in capturing a large body of true-born Spartans. In putting forth this drama, the comedian ran a fearful risk—the risk of nothing less than—of losing the prize! Had it been an aristocrat of Rome, or of Sparta, against whom his 'mala verba' were directed, (and *such* mala verba!) very different would have been the danger. 'The Clouds' is an ignorant and vulgar slander on Socrates and all new knowledge, in which he turns to scorn every study which makes men palefaced, such as geometry, astronomy, geography, grammar, logic, and rhetoric, and accuses Socrates of teaching children to beat their parents, debtors to defraud their creditors, and everybody to despise the gods and

their oaths. To pretend that Aristophanes was seriously shocked by the discourses of Socrates against the popular superstitions, is the part of puerile credulity; for this poet, when it suits his jest, can be profane and impious beyond English utterance or conception. Let us forget the person of Socrates, and there remains in this play a protest in favour of field sports, the palæstra and the ancient lyre against the growth of science and cultivation of the mind. 'The Wasps' is a witty picture of a citizen bitten by a rabies for sitting in the jury box. The poet, however, unfortunately overwrote himself, and the end is so tame, that Mr. Mitchell boldly uses the knife, and cuts off nearly five hundred lines from the end. 'The Birds' is a pantomimic representation of an empire in the clouds, similar to that of the Athenians and of the gods. We are not able to find a trace of its being written to deprecate tyranny over the allies. 'The Lysistrata' is a conspiracy among the women of Athens, Sparta and Thebes, to force their husbands to make peace: the intention of the drama was no doubt in part political. 'The Thesmophoriazusæ' is a tale of the enmity excited in the Athenian women by the slanders which Euripides has uttered on the sex, with his plan for escaping their fury. It is a rancorous attack on that poet, and burlesques a recent play of his. Of the 'Plutus' we say nothing. 'The Frogs' is a yet more laboured assault on Euripides (who was just dead), with numerous clever imitations, both of his poetry and of Æschylus's. Finally, the 'Ecclesiazusæ' is the carrying out into practice Plato's plan of annulling marriage, and giving women the political rights of men. This play is perhaps, of all, the one which it is impossible by any amount of curtailment to reconcile with the laxest conceptions of decency: but for this, Plato is at least as much to blame as Aristophanes. In all these pieces, we find just what might have been expected of a comedian,—viz., a constant effort to raise a laugh, at the expense of anything, man, woman, god, or principle. We do not find fault with him, that he is neither patriot, statesman, nor philosopher, but with those who try to claim these characters for him. As regards his attacks on every low demagogue who successively rises to power, we should be more disposed to think they proceeded from a spirit of patriotism, did he not show equal hostility to better characters. Against the high-born Pericles, and the high-souled Socrates, his slanders are equally flagrant. When he would revile Euripides, he can talk proudly of the good done to the city by Æschylus, in teaching the Athenians to cherish warlike sentiments; yet Laches, the living representative of Æschylus's teaching, is remorselessly ridiculed for imbibing this very spirit. Notwithstanding, as soon as Laches is dead and gone, he is panegyrized by the same comedian, as are his prede-

cessors in prowess, Myronidas and Phormion, merely for the sake of being able to rail at men still alive. Out of all this, to endeavour to build up for the graceless jester a reputation for profound sagacity and political self-devotion, was a problem worthy of a thorough Athenian-hater.

We have naturally dwelt at much length on this side of the author, because Mr. Mitchell's pages teem and overflow with it; and minute criticism on the Greek would not be in place here. We must however say, that Mr. Mitchell's illustrations are exuberant to an extravagance. He is too lavish by far of his erudition, so as frequently to obscure his author. Often, indeed, it is no easy matter to find out how much of a very long note was even meant to help in so secondary an object as elucidating the text. In this respect Mr. Cookesley has greatly the advantage of him, for the latter writes like a man who is not desirous of obtruding upon us either his own accomplishments or his own prejudices. Both writers do us the service of blotting out from the text impurities which it is vexatious and odious to have brought before the eyes every time it is requisite to open the book.

We think we have shown that we are no zealots for Aristophanes, and that we do not see his faults *en couleur de rose*. After this, we may add our conviction, that the increased study of his writings is neither a fancy nor a folly, but is a natural and rightful result of the progress of historical research. Men are seeking to penetrate more deeply into social and domestic character, into daily life and manners, as needful to understanding the nature and history of a people; and in this research the works of a comedian are of peculiar value. If Athens had produced a Miss Edgeworth, her tales and novels would be worth more to us than a shoal of mere political historians.

Art. III. *The Biographical Dictionary of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge.* Three Half Vols. 8vo. London: Longman and Co.

We briefly adverted to the plan and general promise of this work on the appearance of the first half volume, and now recur to it for the purpose of stating more fully our judgment on its merits. Such a work has long been wanted, and we are glad to have it supplied from a quarter which guarantees its respectability and high literary character. Had it been undertaken by an individual, there would have been reason to fear, lest the heavy pecuniary outlay required for its due execution might lead to a parsimonious arrangement, inimical to its completeness. On the present

plan, however, this evil is avoided, and the reputation of a Society, to which the British public are already deeply indebted, is staked on the merits of the work. This satisfaction is further increased by the acknowledged talents and sound learning of the gentlemen to whom the editorial department has been assigned, and the list of distinguished contributors which is given with the second half volume. The high character and former literary productions of Mr. Long, coupled with the aid he has succeeded in obtaining, place beyond reasonable doubt the fulfilment of the promises made to the public, and afford us the pleasing prospect of at length obtaining what has long been needed, but of which we had begun to despair. Our French neighbours have far outstripped us in this matter, having possessed for several years, in the *Biographie Universelle*, which extends to fifty-two volumes, with a *Supplement*, of which twenty volumes have already appeared, a work of vast research, of various and profound learning, at once comprehensive in its range, and most meritorious in its literary execution. The biographical works previously accessible to the English reader were far from superseding the necessity for the present undertaking. Some of them were distinguished by considerable merits, as the *Biographia Britannica*, edited about 1778, by Dr. Kippis, with the assistance of Lords Hailes and Hardwicke, Drs. Douglas and Percy, and other eminent men, and the *General Biography* of Dr. Aikin; to say nothing of *Chalmer's Biographical Dictionary*, the bulk of which greatly exceeds its worth. The edition of the *Biographia Britannica*, edited by Dr. Kippis, was brought down to the letter F only, and as its title imports, its range was restricted to 'the most eminent persons who have flourished in Great Britain and Ireland.' The field of universal biography may therefore be fairly regarded as having been unoccupied prior to the appearance of the present work, which is designed to include memoirs of all persons who 'have done anything for which they ought to be remembered.' 'The completeness,' remarks the editor, 'which a biographical dictionary should aim at, consists in comprising the names of all persons who deserve a notice, and not in containing only elaborate lives of distinguished persons, and omitting those of little importance.'

An admirable feature of the work consists in the full statement of authorities which is appended to each article, thus testing the pains-taking of the writer, and aiding such readers as are so disposed in a more extended investigation of individual biographies. In the case of authors, a list of their works is also furnished, or where this would be too extended, reference is made to some place where such a list may be found. The advantages of this plan are too obvious to need specification, and will be highly

prized by those who are practically acquainted with the labour of research. The initials of each writer are also appended to his productions, and the full name is given at the completion of the volume. Respecting the authorities adduced, the editor remarks, 'The meaning of the authorities is this—they are the materials which the writer has used. They may not be all the materials, for in some cases an article must be constructed from many obscure and unconnected authorities, but they are the principal materials, they are the main evidence for the facts which he states. The judgments and opinions are, in most cases, the writer's own. If it ever happens, owing to any cause, that a writer has not used the best authorities, or if it happens that there are no good authorities, the quality of the writer's materials will be indicated by the authorities which are cited; but in all cases the reader will have the means of judging of the value of the information, and of testing its accuracy. Where the authorities are indifferent, he will see that he must be content with the little that is said, or he must take the trouble of looking for more; where they are good and sufficient, he will have the means of carrying his inquiries further than the limits of a biographical dictionary permit the writer to do. Some books are quoted among the authorities, not as being original sources of information, but as useful works, in which a reader may find something to his purpose.'

Three half volumes of the work are now before us, and we have been at some pains to qualify ourselves to give an impartial and sound opinion on the extent to which it is likely to realize the expectations awakened by its announcement. These were by no means very limited, as the quarter whence the work proceeds, and the literary arrangements which were understood to have been made, were of an order to raise sanguine anticipations. Whatever those may have been, we feel no hesitation in averring that they are in a fair way of being met, for it has rarely fallen to our lot to examine a work of this kind, the general execution of which has been so creditable to the learning and good taste, both of the editor and of his several contributors. Considerable varieties are of course observable in the style and apparent diligence of different writers, and much difficulty must have been experienced in determining the space which should be devoted to individual lives. For the most part, little more could be attempted than a succinct narrative, coupled, in the case of authors and artists, with brief criticisms on their works; but the instances are not few in which literary topics and general principles of criticism are discussed in a manner as pleasing to the intelligent reader, as it is creditable to the respective writers. Considerable attention has evidently been paid to oriental litera-

ture, at which we are the more gratified from the general inattention it has met with even from literary men. The work abounds in ample proofs of the efficient aid which Mr. Long has secured in this department of his labour. The first volume comprises 1661 memoirs, and contains probably as large a portion of instructive and entertaining reading as any book ever published. The character and worth of the work, however, will best appear from an inspection of its contents, to enable our readers to judge of which we shall give such extracts as our brief space permits. We take the following from an admirable article on *Abailard*, furnished by Professor Forbes, of King's College, London, in which the nicest sense of moral propriety is united to an admiring appreciation of the dialectic skill of the great logician.

'As an original thinker Abailard does not claim a very high place. He followed the course of Roscelin, who was the first bold investigator of the received dogmas of the age. 'The name of Abailard,' says Guizot, 'is not associated with any great idea; his age being one of movement, not of foundation. But this movement he encouraged and directed.' His great skill was as a dialectician, which he first displayed in advocating the philosophy of the Nominalists, in opposition to that of the Realists. The latter held that genera and species were real existences; the former, that general terms are not the representatives of realities, but are only mental abstractions, and that the only realities are individual entities. Böethius (*Comment. in Cic. Top.* iv. c. 6) has expressed in few words the realistic opinion; 'Plato laid it down that there were certain *ideæ*, that is, *species* incorporeal, and *substances* permanent and in themselves distinct from other things in their nature, as for instance Man; and that by their participation in these ideæ, other things became men or animals.' The skill of Abailard in dealing with these and similar questions was unrivalled; but his victories, though due to the subtlety, acuteness, precision, order, and promptitude of his intellect, must still share a part of the honour with the philological abuses of the age. Words were reckoned as ideas and things. Many of their syllogistic triumphs are solely attributable to what Bentham would call the setting up of fictitious entities. But the extensive influence of Abailard upon his age, as witnessed not only by the rivalry and jealousy which he excited, but by the circumstance of the thousands of scholars who flocked round him, even when he was driven to lead a hermit's life in solitude, must be attributed to his eloquence as a highly gifted and practised orator. The chief principle that he inculcated may be called the teaching of men to listen to reason; and he did this at a time when there was the least degree of reason among the most learned.

'The character of Abailard may be clearly collected from the account he has given of himself in his 'Historia Calamitatum.' His ruling passion was the love of making subtle distinctions, and of teaching as one who felt that he had authority; out of which grew an almost equal

delight in disputation. His love of disputation was encouraged by constant provocation and almost constant success. It mainly contributed to his unhappiness and ruin, both directly and indirectly; it tended to deaden the moral feelings and affections, and to render cold a heart that was not originally very warm. If his passion for Heloise had been greater than his ambition, he would at once have married her, and escaped the sorrows that he brought upon himself and her. He acknowledges that his love had never been worthy of her. But Abailard conceals none of his faults. There is not the least hypocrisy in him, either to others or to himself; and he commands our respect and sympathy, as one who suffered persecution for the free expression of opinion. Independent of all his great acquirements and his eloquence, Abailard was a very accomplished man, and probably composed the music to many of his own songs, which Heloise informs us he sung with so sweet a voice. He was the most popular song-writer of his day, at the very time that he stood first as a theologian, a logician, and public instructor. A story which is told by Accursius and Odofredus, of one Petrus Bailardus, so far from proving him to be a jurist, as some writers have imagined, proves, as Savigny observes, that he neither was nor wished to be a jurist. This Petrus Bailardus is supposed to be Abailard. (Savigny, *Geschichte des Röm Rechtes im Mittelalter*, iv. 374.) Abailard was also unacquainted with the mathematics, as he himself informs us in the manuscript of St. Victor.

'The highly impassioned and devoted character of Heloise is sufficiently shown by her letters and the whole course of her life. The contemplation of her position when she first met Abailard, developes a very curious fact as to the estimate and treatment of women in her age. She was celebrated all over the kingdom for her learning and accomplishments, and yet she was placed in the hands of a tutor to whom permission was given to use personal chastisement whenever he thought fit. To Abailard her love and obedience were unbounded. During their whole acquaintance he never thought of her except for himself, as he subsequently told her; she never thought of herself except for him. To him both alive and dead she devoted herself. Her temperament and her tastes utterly unfitted her for a conventual life; nevertheless, she fulfilled her duties as an abbess in an exemplary manner.

'The personal appearance of Abailard is said to have been noble, graceful, and commanding. Of the person of Heloise nothing very definite is known. It may be inferred that they were both of rather tall stature, if credit is to be given to the description of their bones, on the examination which took place on their last exhumation.'—Vol. i., pp. 30, 31.

Our next extract is of a different order. It pertains to the history of the French monarchy during the latter part of Louis XV.'s reign, and goes far to account for the infuriated reaction which ensued a few years later. It forms part of the memoir of *Aiguillon*, a descendant of Cardinal Richelieu, and one of those great bad men whom Providence occasion-

ally permits to curse a nation. At the period to which the extract refers, Aiguillon had been convicted of having obtained by suborned evidence a sentence of death against M. de la Chalotais, a man of genius and spirit, who had denounced 'in the parliament of Rennes the iniquities of his provincial administration.'

'But Aiguillon possessed a source of strength more than sufficient to support him against all his enemies. Nursed in those court intrigues by which all affairs, even the most momentous wars and treaties, were determined in the reign of Louis XV., he had fortified himself with the friendship of Madame du Barry, whom he had introduced to Louis after the death of Madame Pompadour; and as his influence over that lady was as unlimited as her ascendant over Louis, he thus exercised an indirect control over the king. Another circumstance concurred to render his power irresistible. Madame du Barry was full of resentment against the Duc de Choiseul, who had opposed her introduction at court; she was irritated at the repulses which she had met with in her advances to that minister, and was eager to wreak her revenge by seconding Aiguillon in subverting his administration. But though the influence and power of Aiguillon, through these means, outweighed those of the minister, he was alarmed with just apprehensions of the judicial sentence which hung over him; nor could he have averted the vengeance of the parliament, had he not by a rare fortune found in the heart of Choiseul's cabinet an instrument who not only sheltered him from impending ruin, but paved the way for his advancement to power.

'The Chancellor Maupeou, an ambitious, corrupt, and daring minister, no sooner observed Choiseul sinking under the superior influence of Aiguillon than he formed a coalition with the rising ex-commandant of Brittany; and he paid assiduous court to Madame du Barry, the fountain of honours, by entering into all the views of her favourite. As the head of the law, he exercised the influence of his office over the parliament of Paris; and he was the man in France the best fitted by his functions to stay or overrule the proceedings still urgently pressed forwards by that body against Aiguillon. Animated by the hope of new power, and no way dismayed by the determined front opposed by the parliament, he shrunk not from renewing those conflicts between the court and the supreme tribunal so fatal to royal authority, nor from exposing the king to the hazards of a contest with the parliament in defence of a criminal, of whose guilt the evidence had never been questioned. The heads of the accusation were very grave; subornation, tyranny, an attempt to poison: but once resolved, the resolutions of Maupeou were inflexible, and he carried through his design of screening the delinquent, and crushing the parliament with signal energy. He thought first to overawe that assembly without recourse to violence; and he found no difficulty in persuading Louis, now worn down with debauchery, to call together the parliament to Versailles, and, presiding in person, to convey such intimation of the

royal wishes as might induce them to drop the proceedings, and so carry a vote to that effect. This first meeting of Louis and the parliament, which took place in April, 1770, passed so peaceably, that the chancellor and Aiguillon imagined themselves secure, and were surprised when the parliament, secretly supported by Choiseul, renewed the attack, and proceeded towards a sentence of condemnation against the duke. The next step of the court (for the minister sided with the parliament) was a direct interposition of the royal authority in favour of Aiguillon, which brought the king into open collision with that body. In June, Louis summoned the parliament to a bed of justice at Versailles, that is, to a session where the king presided in all the forms of royalty. The chancellor, in a menacing tone, rebuked the contumacy of the parliament, and in the name of the king, commanded them to cease the prosecution. This was a stretch of prerogative unprecedented even in the absolute monarchy of France. Beds of justice to compel the registration of fiscal edicts and other royal ordonnances were conformable to the established maxims of the French government, and had acquired sanction from precedents so ancient as in the judgments of lawyers to be no longer questionable; but to suspend a penal process by the authority of the king was an act of power which even Cardinal Richelieu had never attempted. The parliament was inflamed by this aggression of the crown, and made haste to vindicate their jurisdiction by proceeding to a sentence against Aiguillon. In July they passed a judgment of attainder, by which he was deprived of all his rights and honours as a peer. Aiguillon and Maupeou, who grew bolder at every stage of the contest, were no way disconcerted by this blow. These fierce and impetuous spirits, in whose hands the pageant king, in the last stage of his dissolute life, was an instrument, thundered out an arrêt or ordonnance of the royal council, by which they quashed the judgment of the parliament and reinstated Aiguillon in all his honours. This was the mode in which Cardinal Richelieu was wont to crush the refractory parliaments of his day when they resisted his edicts of confiscation and proscription by counter decrees; and was a less violent exertion of arbitrary power than the former interposition, an edict of the council being in the judgment of French jurists equivalent to a royal ordonnance registered in the parliament. When the court struck this last blow, all the resources of the parliament were exhausted; and it had now recourse to remonstrance. The members persisted in successive deputations to the king, complaining of their grievances in a style glowing with suppressed indignation, which kept alive the popular ferment, and held Aiguillon in continual inquietude. The danger of that nobleman was not yet past. The evidence of his crimes was in the archives of the parliament; its register contained the record of his conviction; and there was nothing to prevent that body, upon any new turn of faction, renewing their proceedings against him. Some fresh act of power, and that more vigorous and decisive than the last, he deemed necessary for his safety. In September, 1770, the king suddenly entered Paris, surrounded the parliament with his guards, held a summary bed of justice, and after reprehend-

ing, through the mouth of Maupeou the chancellor, their obstinate presumption in transgressing their jurisdiction, he called for the register and tore from it the minutes of the proceedings and the judgment against Aiguillon. In this measure Aiguillon and Maupeou again followed in the steps of Cardinal Richelieu, who in 1631, when the parliament refused to register his edict of attainder against the adherents of Mary de Medicis, and placed on their archives a counter decree of remonstrance, summoned them to the gallery of the Louvre, and made Louis XIII. tear their decree with his own hand from the register. A second bed of justice followed after a short interval, in which the king tendered to them a general ordonnance, which declared it to be incumbent on the parliament to register all edicts emanating from the throne; and this law, which destroyed the last shadow of legislative authority residing in the parliament, received a compulsory registration.

'During this violent career, in which Aiguillon trampled down the supreme tribunal of France, the only shield of the nation against arbitrary sway, Choiseul, despoiled of all power, still clung to his office, while his rival, all-powerful, awaited the convenient moment for his expulsion. The political authority of the parliament being destroyed, and that council reduced to the functions of a mere judicature, all things were ripe for the fall of Choiseul. On Christmas, 1770, the lettre de cachet dismissing and ordering him into exile, was delivered to that minister. Aiguillon, impeached and convicted, and lately on the brink of punishment, became from that moment supreme in France, with the parliament at his mercy, and the last control on the executive government overthrown. Some time, however, elapsed before the seals of office were formally delivered to him. Aiguillon was fifty years of age when he thus seized the reins of government, which he held with a vigorous hand till the death of Louis XV. He had neither the eloquence of Choiseul, nor the knowledge or comprehensive mind by which that minister was distinguished. Activity, subtlety, penetration, promptitude in resolution,—these, the arts by which he rose, were better fitted to elevate him to the office of foreign minister, than to qualify him for the vast and complicated questions of external policy which then agitated France. The commencement of his power was marked by his usual energy, and his administration was signalised by several memorable events which render it a kind of æra in the decline and fall of the Bourbon dynasty. Of these, the most remarkable, both in design and execution, was the destruction of the parliament of Paris, an institution which was coeval with the earliest periods of the French monarchy. Stripped of its legislative powers, and deprived of its patron Choiseul, the parliament had never abated the energy of its indignant remonstrances against the illegal acts which had wrested from them their ancient privileges. Seeing all the remaining barriers of the constitution levelled by Aiguillon, and dreading a total annihilation of justice, they resolved to abandon their judicial functions; and they thought to embarrass the new administration by the disorder incident to the cessation of the legal tribunals. They sent fresh depu-

tations to Versailles, intimating their resolution no longer to continue their session. The king replied by an arbitrary mandate, ordering them to resume their functions. The parliament was inflexible, and Paris was thrown into confusion by the denial of justice, and by the agitation which prevailed among the lawyers. Aiguillon and the Chancellor Maupeou, who, having reaped the reward of his subserviency, stood foremost in this continued conflict, had gone too far to recede, or even relax their vigour in the prosecution of their design, now visibly formed, of rendering the king wholly absolute. They resolved on the dissolution of the parliament, and the banishment of all the refractory members. In the month of January, 1771, at midnight, two musqueteers arrived at the house of each counsellor of parliament at the same moment, and, tendering him the question 'whether he would resume his duties?' commanded him to answer simply, yes or no. The members, roused from their slumber, and in confusion at so rude a summons, were scarce allowed time to collect themselves: by far the greater number, refusing to comply with the demands of the court, were banished to remote parts of France, some to Languedoc, some to Mont St. Michel, and the remnant, whose subserviency recommended them to the favour of the chancellor, in the present exigency of justice, were formed into a new tribunal, which wholly superseded the ancient parliament.'—Ib. pp. 551—553.

The following comparison, or rather contrast, between D'Alembert and Voltaire, taken from an article on the former, by Professor de Morgan, of University College, is at once discriminating and correct.

'The writings of D'Alembert show something of the sort of character which he attributed to himself in the autography above cited, particularly the correspondence. There is abundance of pleasantry, much satire, and little or no affectation. Brought up as he was in comparative retirement, and not introduced into the gay society of the capital till his mind and manners were tolerably well fixed, he did not acquire either the ease or the levity of the fashionable world. In this, and in every other point, the only person with whom it is curious to compare D'Alembert is his colleague and friend Voltaire; and the more so, because both go together in the minds of Englishmen of the last and present generation in the undiscriminating abuse which is lavished upon their common irreligion; while Diderot, infinitely below either in mind and attainments, makes a third. We cannot even allow the circumstance just named to be reason enough for entering upon the character of Diderot in this place; but Voltaire and D'Alembert are inseparable. The latter was thinking while the former was reading and writing, and consequently was as superior in justness and clearness as in depth. Even the sentiments of the two on the subject of Christianity were as different as could be; D'Alembert was a serious sceptic, Voltaire a laughing dogmatist. The satire of both, with two very different kinds of power, was showered upon the numerous instances of stupid fanaticism which came in their way, and their in-

dignation upon the no less frequent displays of legal atrocity: but D'Alembert apparently felt no interest in carrying these arms further, while Voltaire found himself as much impelled to extract ridicule from the first chapter of Genesis as from the judgment of a provincial court, or the remonstrance of an injudicious abbé. If D'Alembert had set himself to write against revelation, he would have made most of his converts in England; Voltaire was the best imaginable apostle for the Frenchman of the old monarchy. Neither is, we imagine, ever called learned; but D'Alembert was as far from having gone through the extensive miscellaneous reading of Voltaire, as from possessing his brilliant but superficial range of thought. D'Alembert had little or no depth of reading, even in mathematics; he could do anything, and had no great need of a guide. He re-invented Taylor's theorem, but never, as far as appears, to the day of his death, was aware that another had been before him. He did not even take any pains to know the various new discoveries which were made around him in the physical sciences; but he is, beyond all comparison, the most philosophical of the French mathematicians, and the quantity of thought on the first principles of the exact sciences which is found in his writings is very large, insomuch that, in like manner as, when the author of a formula is doubtful, the querist first ascertains whether or no it is Euler's, so when a good idea on the foundation of any part of analysis is to be traced to its source, it will be a saving of time to settle the claims of D'Alembert before inquiring into those of any one else. As to other points of character, his pecuniary liberality, particularly to his foster-mother, always cost him a large part of his income; and his spirit towards other men of science was, we believe, in every instance, good. He and Clairaut were rivals, and no work of either appeared without finding a severe critic in the other; but D'Alembert, the more cautious and profound of the two, was generally on the right side of the question: we may add that their disputes never degenerated into squabble. Lagrange and Laplace both owed their first advantageous settlements in life to D'Alembert; the former at the Prussian court, the latter in a professorship at Paris.'—Ib., pp. 809, 810.

In his zeal to defend the French philosopher from the charge of having designated Christianity, the 'infamous' (infâme), Mr. De Morgan permits himself to indulge in a silly sneer—we can really call it by no better name—against such as deem church-rates a grievance. He speaks of those whose 'worst ecclesiastical grievance of the legal kind is a three-and-sixpenny church-rate.' Who these may be we know not, and Mr. Morgan himself would be at some loss, if required, to point them out. We deem church-rates a grievance, and hundreds of thousands of our countrymen deem them so too, but there are other grievances still worse,—the most notorious and flagrant of which is the incorporation of things spiritual and temporal in the state church. What Mr. De Morgan meant to insinuate is very obvious; but

what he says is untrue to fact, and out of place, in a work otherwise honourably exempt from sectarian influences.

Our space must restrict us to one more extract, which we take from the memoir of Alfred, the greatest of our Anglo-Saxon monarchs. The whole article, which is furnished by George L. Craik, Esq., will amply repay an attentive perusal. The following summary of the character of this illustrious man, and of the services which he rendered to his country, is as just as it is discriminating:—

'Putting out of view the imputations already noticed, which refer exclusively to the first few years of his reign, and, rightly considered, rather set off and enhance the conquest over himself which he afterwards achieved, the lustre of Alfred's character, both as a man and as a king, is without spot or shade. He is charged with no vice; and, besides the cheerful and unpretending exhibition of all the ordinary virtues in his every-day life, the untoward circumstances in which he was placed, and the afflictions with which he was tried, were continually striking out from his happy nature sparks and flashes of the heroic and sublime. He triumphed over pain as he had triumphed over passion; his active exertions in arms, and his unintermitted labours of every other kind, were carried on while he was suffering under the torment and debility of a disease which never left him, and which probably at last brought him to his grave. The field in which he acted was limited and obscure; but that too makes part of his glory, for of all the rulers who have been styled 'the Great,' there is no one to whom the epithet has been given with more general acclamation than to this king of the West Saxons. His fame transcends that of most conquerors, although he won it all by what he did for his own subjects, and within his own petty principality. But probably no king ever did more for his country than Alfred, at least, if we measure what he accomplished by his means and his difficulties. His preservation of it from conquest by the Northmen in the latter part of his reign, was perhaps as great an achievement as his previous recovery of its independence, when all seemed to be lost, and the foreigner had actually acquired the possession of the soil; the latter contest at least was much the more protracted one, and appears to have called for and brought out more of Alfred's high qualities—his activity, his vigilance, his various military talent, his indomitable patience and endurance, his spirit of hope that nothing could quench, as well as his mere valour. That contest with Hastings, too, was marked by several generous actions on the part of Alfred, not admitting of notice in a brief outline, which displayed the magnanimity of his character in the strongest light. Nor let it be said that Alfred's heroic efforts after all proved ineffectual, inasmuch as England, notwithstanding, was at last subjugated by those Danish invaders whom he twice drove off: this did not happen till after more than a century of independence and freedom obtained by his exertions; and, at any rate, his success, even if the Anglo-Saxons had preserved their liberties for a much shorter

time, would still have given to the history of the world one of its most precious possessions, another example of persevering courage and strength of heart winning the battle over the darkest and most disastrous circumstances. This was a lesson of hope and encouragement which those who came after him could never lose by any change of fortune. The actual improvements in the department of the national defence for which his country was indebted to Alfred, were the already mentioned commencement of the royal navy, various improvements in the building of ships, the protection of the coast by, it is said, no fewer than fifty forts or castles erected in the course of his reign on the most exposed or otherwise important points, and the establishment of a regular order of military service, according to which one half of the male population of the proper age was called to the field, and the other allowed to remain at home in turns, instead of the whole, as formerly, being obliged to serve for a limited time. In this way the demands both of war and of agriculture were properly provided for. Alfred has been commonly represented as a great innovator in the civil institutions of the Anglo-Saxons; but it is probable that he attempted little, if anything, more in this department than the restoration of the old laws and establishments of police, which had fallen into inefficiency in the confusions and troubles that preceded his reign. The body of laws which professes to be of his enactment, consists almost entirely of a selection from those of Ethelbert of Kent, Ina of Wessex, Offa of Mercia, and other preceding kings, with the addition of some portions of the Mosaic code. Ingulfus and other later writers attribute to him the division of the country into shires, hundreds, and tithings, and the establishment of a system which made every man in some degree responsible for the peace of his district, and for the conduct of every other inhabitant; but it is in the highest degree probable that all this, in so far as it does or ever did actually exist, is of much earlier origin. We may, however, believe that Alfred maintained a strict and efficient police in his dominions, without taking literally what is asserted by William of Malmsbury, that a purse of money or a pair of golden bracelets would, in the time of this king, remain for weeks exposed in the highway without risk of depredation. It may also be true, as Ingulfus relates, that he first appointed a justiciary or special officer for the hearing of causes in every shire; dividing the authority which had formerly resided in a single governor, between that functionary and the viscount, or sheriff. But that Alfred, as has been often said, was the founder or inventor of trial by jury, is certainly an erroneous notion; the jury trial of the Anglo-Saxons was altogether a different thing from what is now known by that name, and was also undoubtedly much more ancient than the time of Alfred. The most important of Alfred's patriotic services, and those at the same time of which we have the best evidence, consist in what he did for the literature of his country, and the intellectual improvement of his subjects. In addition to the establishment of schools in all the principal towns, having himself at the late age of thirty-nine begun the study of Latin under the direction of some of the learned men whom he invited to his court from all parts,

Grimbold, or Grimbald, of St. Omer, and John of Corvei, from the Continent, as well as Asser, from St. David's, in Wales, and Plegmund, Werferth, and others from Mercia, he did not rest satisfied till he had turned his new acquirements to account, by translating into the popular tongue such treatises as he conceived to be best suited for his countrymen.'—Vol. ii., pp. 90, 91.

In dismissing, for the present, this work, we record our deliberate judgment that it constitutes one of the most valuable additions which, for many years past, have been made to our literature. The various and profound learning which it displays, the impartiality of its criticisms, its sound judgment and freedom from prejudice, both political and religious, promise to render it an undertaking alike honourable to the Society with whom it has originated, and commensurate with the wants and capabilities of our present literature.

Art. IV. *Personal Recollections.* By Charlotte Elizabeth.—Seeley. 1841.

All autobiography is valuable, whether it be the mere simple detail of every-day life, or the narrative of strange and startling incidents,—the legacy of the writer who pours forth his inmost feelings before a world in which he has no longer any share, or the earnest vindication of the still living author, anxious to gain the praise, or to avert the censure of his contemporaries,—for in each of these we are sure to find revealed, intentionally or, it may be, unintentionally, those numerous peculiarities of mental character which are so important to the psychological inquirer.

If, however, the writer be one well known in any department of popular literature, his autobiography becomes additionally valuable, from the light it cannot fail to throw on the formation of his intellectual character, and the traces which it will afford of the origin and growth of those views and feelings which, strongly impressed on his own mind, become necessarily impressed on his works. The autobiography now before us claims attention from this circumstance; the author, an intelligent and most excellent woman, being one whose earlier writings, unpretending as they are, have exercised no slight influence over a wide sphere, while her later productions are characterized by so undistinguishing and furious a hostility to whatever can be considered to have reference to popery, that it reminds us of the days of 'Lillibulero,' and the pious abjuration of 'The Pope, the Devil, and the Pretender.' And yet it is from the earnest eloquence with which the writer pours forth her denunciations

against all the aiders and abettors of popery—whether 'carnal minded statesmen,' or time-serving politicians, or, worse than all, 'the disciples of liberalism,'—that her narrative becomes actually interesting. Her sincerity is so obviously beyond all challenge; her feelings so warm and generous, even when most perversely wrong, that we feel as though we were listening to the enthusiastic personal narrative of one of the Croises, who felt it his bounden duty to go forth to battle with the paynim, and who deemed the only argument with the heathen would be the unanswerable one of his good sword.

Charlotte Elizabeth was born in Norwich, and the theory of the strong influence of early associations is fully corroborated in her case.

'The sphere in which it is my dearest privilege to labour is the cause of Protestantism; and sometimes, when God has blessed my poor efforts to the deliverance of some captive out of the chains of Popish delusion, I have recalled the fact of being born just opposite the dark old gateway of that strong building where the glorious martyrs of Mary's day were imprisoned. I have recollected that the house wherein I drew my first breath was visible through the grated window of their prison, and a conspicuous object when its gates unfolded to deliver them to unjust judgment and a cruel death. Are any of the prayers of those glorified saints fulfilled in the poor child who was brought into the world on that particular spot, though at the distance of some ages? The query could not be answered, but the thought has frequently cheered me on. The stern-looking gateway, opening on St. Martin's Plain, was probably one of the very first objects traced on the retina of my infant eye, when it ranged beyond the inner walls of the nursery: and often, with tottering step, I passed beneath that arch into the splendid garden of our noble episcopal palace; and certainly, if my Protestantism may not be traced to that locality, my taste may; for from all the elaborate display of modern architecture, all the profuse luxuriance and endless variety of modern horticulture, I now turn away, to feast in thought on the recollection of that venerable scene. The palace itself is a fine specimen of the chaste old English style; but the most conspicuous, the most unforgetable feature was the cathedral itself, which formed the boundary of one-half of the garden: a mass of sober magnificence, rising in calm repose against the sky, which, to my awe-struck gaze and childish imagination, seemed to rest upon its exquisitely formed spire.'—pp. 5, 6.

The last remark is rather curious, for it was no Protestant hand that founded the cathedral or reared its beautiful spire; we suppose, however, that as the cathedral was then the property of 'mother church,' the question how she became possessed of it was considered as unnecessary to be answered. But, on other ecclesiastical subjects, the little girl's father took care to supply her with abundant information; this among the rest:—

'Norwich was infamously conspicuous in persecuting unto death the saints of the Most High, under the sanguinary despotism of Popish Mary; and the spot where they suffered, called the Lollard's Pit, lies just outside the town, over Bishop's bridge, having a circular excavation against the side of Moushold-hill. This, at least within a year or two ago, was kept distinct, an opening by the road-side. My father often took us to walk in that direction, and pointed out the pit, and told us that there Mary burnt good people alive for refusing to worship wooden images. I was horror-stricken, and asked many questions, to which he did not always reply so fully as I wished; and one day, having to go out while I was inquiring, he said, 'I don't think you can read a word of this book, but you may look at the pictures: it is all about the martyrs.' So saying, he placed on a chair the old folio of Foxe's Acts and Monuments, in venerable black letter, and left me to examine it.

'Hours passed, and still found me bending over, or rather leaning against that magic book. I could not, it is true, decypher the black letter; but I found some examinations in Roman type, and devoured them; while every wood-cut was examined with aching eyes and a palpitating heart. Assuredly I took in more of the spirit of John Foxe, even by that imperfect mode of acquaintance, than many do by reading his book through; and when my father next found me at what became my darling study, I looked up at him with burning cheeks, and asked, 'Papa, may I be a martyr?'

''What do you mean, child?'

''I mean, papa, may I be burned to death for my religion, as these were? I want to be a martyr.'

'He smiled, and made me this answer, which I have never forgotten, 'Why, Charlotte, if the government ever gives power to the Papists again, as they talk of doing, you may very probably live to be a martyr.'—pp. 13, 14.

'I well remember the stern pleasure this reply afforded me,' she remarks; and yet, 'of spiritual knowledge not the least glimmer had reached me in any form.' In what respect, then, did this poor child's wish for martyrdom differ from that which impels so many a heathen to lay down his life for his belief? Such questions, however, did not disturb the early days of Charlotte Elizabeth. Her father, a canon of Norwich and a resident clergyman, was a Tory of the highest order, and a churchman of the straitest school; and in such vehement 'church-and-king' feelings was she nourished, that she and her brother, on the appointed fast days, willingly put away their toys, and were 'content with our salt fish and egg sauce.'

The clergy of Norwich indeed, seem, at this period of political excitement, (the close of the last century,) to have been members emphatically of a church militant. The reverend canon, on one occasion, joined in an attack on 'some apostles of

revolution, and drove the intruders out of the town.' The state of Norwich, however, was certainly very terrible, worse even than Lincoln, which is constantly, according to the old proverb, under the supervision of a certain personage. But here 'Antichrist bestrode our city, firmly planting there his two cloven hoofs of Popery and Socinianism!' It is well he had not a third hoof, as it is impossible to tell where that might not have been planted. To increase the evil, about this time an appointment took place in which Antichrist, as is hinted, probably had a share—the elevation of Dr. Bathurst to the see of Norwich. To this estimable man Charlotte Elizabeth concedes the merit of being perfectly sincere, and disinterested, too, in his views; and she bears a testimony creditable to herself to his many virtues. The earnestness with which he supported every liberal measure, and especially that of catholic emancipation, rendered him, however, most distasteful to our writer's father; although—

'That it was disinterested no one could doubt; for when the ministry of the day were stiffly opposed to the concession, and Dr. Bathurst was informed that if he advocated it in parliament he would assuredly be left in that miserably poor see, whereas his silence might facilitate a translation that must needs be to a better—a thing which his very large family rendered desirable enough—the intimation only increased his zeal: he rose in his place, and spoke most energetically in favour of the measure. When he resumed his seat, the Peer next him said, somewhat sarcastically, 'I am happy to find the air of Norwich agrees so well with your lordship: you don't seem inclined to change it.' To which the bishop meekly replied, 'My lord, whatever I change, I trust I shall not change my principles.'"—pp. 57, 58.

And, as the reader well knows, Bishop of Norwich he continued to his death.

The youth of Charlotte Elizabeth seems to have been a pleasant one; but while she censures herself—we think, too severely,—for her indulgence in day-dreams, and desultory and light reading, she seems to have forgotten that, as she was subsequently to become a writer, this literary trifling, as it may now appear to her, most probably gave her that facility of thought and expression of which she was ere long to reap the benefit. The sudden death of her father, to whom she was devotedly attached, was but the beginning of her troubles; these were soon increased by an unfortunate marriage with an officer of the Rifles, whom she speedily followed to North America. The account of her voyage and the incidents that took place during her stay in Nova Scotia are delightfully written, and present powers of description of no common order; nor is it until her return to England that we find her no-popery principles again breaking forth.

Her return was swiftly followed by a summons to Ireland,

whither her husband had gone to engage in a lawsuit; and with feelings of the keenest regret at leaving her native England, and disgust at her intended sojourn in the 'green isle,' 'on a dull day in April,' she took her place, a solitary traveller, in the Shrewsbury coach. On her arrival at Oxford, 'those old grey towers and mighty masses of ancient building, on which the silvery ray fell with fine effect,' awakened in her bosom most mournful recollections. Oxford was her father's university. He was dead—and his daughter, unhappily married, was now pursuing her unprotected way to a stranger land. 'This was England, my own proud England. I was bound for Ireland! What English young lady had ever studied the history of that half-civilized settlement called Ireland? Not I certainly, nor any of my acquaintance.' And thus from Charlotte Elizabeth's deliberate acknowledgment, the whole past history of Ireland, the grinding oppressions under which for centuries she had been crushed, the fierce intolerance which had for many generations pointed out the Irish papist as the aim for every 'protestant boy's' gun, were alike unknown; and unconscious of the persecutions, which might well nigh fill an Irish Roman-catholic book of martyrs, she set foot on the land, prepared to marvel that the Irish spirit should chafe beneath the gentle yoke of 'free and glorious England!'

After a short stay in Dublin, she proceeded to her residence in 'a very little, aristocratical town.' The scenes, however, which took place there under her eye, might, we should think, have convinced her, that the Irish had somewhat justly to complain of.

'At the time I am now to speak of, I was living in perfect seclusion, and uninterrupted solitude. Captain —— was always in Dublin, and my chief occupation was in hunting out, and transcribing and arranging matter for the professional gentlemen conducting the lawsuit, from a mass of confused family papers and documents. Our property consisted of a large number of poor cabins, with their adjoining land, forming a complete street on the outskirts of the town, which was greatly in arrear to the head landlords, and a periodical 'distress' took place. On these occasions, a keeper was set over the property; some legal papers were served, and all the household goods, consisting of iron kettles, wooden stools, broken tables, a ragged blanket or two, and the little store of potatoes, the sole support of the wretched inhabitants, were brought out, piled in a long row down the street, and 'canted,' that is, put up to sale, for the payment of, perhaps, one or two per cent. of the arrears. This horrified me beyond measure. I was ashamed to be seen among the people who were called our tenants, though this proceeding did not emanate from their immediate landlord; and every thing combined to render the seclusion of my own garden more congenial to me than any wider range.'—pp. 110, 111.

It was here that, secluded from all society, even from the ordinary means of grace,—from which, however, had a gospel ministry been within her reach, she could scarcely have profited, owing to the severe deafness with which she had been afflicted from childhood, — that she determined to become a perfect devotee in religion, 'a sort of Protestant nun.' Her determination did not last long; she became very wretched, more wretched, indeed, though she redoubled her prayers and exertions. At length a neighbour sent her some books, and among them one describing the death-bed of a young man; and his expressions of deep self-condemnation attracted her attention—they were so similar to her own. Reading on she discovered, with surprise, that his end was peaceful—that he actually died rejoicing!

Happy would it have been for Charlotte Elizabeth had she, at this period, obtained the counsel and advice of some experienced Christians, since, from the circumstances of her conversion, she seems to have considered that every view which did not at that period appear to her erroneous, was evidently in accordance with God's word. 'Few, very few, have been so privileged as I was, to be left alone with the infallible teaching of God the Holy Ghost, by means of the written word, for so many weeks, and so to get a thorough knowledge of the great doctrines of salvation, unclouded by man's vain wisdom,' is her remark. Now the great doctrines to which she refers are held by all the orthodox Christian communities; while the minor points which she holds with, we think, equal pertinacity, have been repeatedly impugned by persons who have brought, not merely an equal degree of sincerity, but far better disciplined powers of mind to bear upon the subject.

Her first attempt after this, she tells us, was to bring the Liturgy and Articles of her church to the test of Scripture; she had 'no books of a religious character, not one; no clergyman among my acquaintance, no means of inquiry, as regarded my own church.' But was there not then evidently a bias, and a strong one, in favour of the church of her childhood, 'the church of her fathers?' And yet she is fully satisfied that she conducted this inquiry with the same freedom from prejudice with which she had imbibed the great truths of the Gospel.

Now let us take the parallel circumstance of an equally intelligent girl, the daughter of a dissenting minister, brought up from infancy in dissenting forms, and accustomed in the family circle to hear repeated eulogies on the simplicity and scriptural character of our worship. Let 'Pilgrim's Progress' be put early into her hands, with the remark, that good John Bunyan would never have written that book if wicked men had not put

him in prison for twelve years for the sole crime of preaching the Gospel; and when she might indignantly ask, why these wicked men did so? let some of Delaune's and Alsop's vigorous and caustic works be given her. And let us view her as growing up a mere formalist, but still surrounded by dissenting associates, and no others, until her conversion takes place. Would it not be all but impossible that she should be otherwise than a dissenter? But would her earnest asseverations that she had been convinced by Scripture alone of the 'divine right of dissent,' avail her in the opinion of churchmen? Would not Charlotte Elizabeth herself say, if reviewing this dissenter's autobiography, 'Were early associations nothing? Were controversial works nothing? Were sympathies early awakened in the cause of persecuted dissenters nothing?' And yet as little claim to unbiassed opinion can our author advance, as the character we have imagined.

We have dwelt more at length upon this part of Charlotte Elizabeth's narrative, because we think that the blind, and almost furious bigotry which disfigures so many pages in the works of an otherwise excellent writer, may, in great measure, be traced to her notion, that because she sought out her doctrinal creed without assistance of human writings—without, indeed, any educational bias, (for she tells us she was surprised at finding the doctrine of regeneration in the Prayer Book,) she exercised an equally unprejudiced judgment, when, by a similar process, she set about determining questions of church-government, and even of political opinion. But while on doctrinal points, points which she willingly admits were of mighty importance, her father most culpably had afforded her no instruction; on the minor points, her mind had been fully made up. For full thirty years she had been a vehement tory, a high-church-woman, a despiser of the Irish, and a most hearty hater of the Papists; in one respect alone, in regard to these four points, had her views undergone any change; it is, that partiality for the Irish had succeeded her aversion. How, indeed, without an especial inspired guidance into every question historical and political, which certainly is nowhere promised—her views should have been altered, would be difficult to say; but of that inspired guidance, Charlotte Elizabeth seems fully confident, for her answer is, and the reader will find it to be that of a large, and busy, religious party—that she went to the Bible for truth, and as no particular text expressly condemned her views, and especially as she felt, and still feels, as she says, a growing conviction that she is right, *ergo*, she is. But Scripture has told us, that even an inspired Apostle could hold erroneous views on minor points. The Apostle Peter, himself, declared that he considered it unlawful to hold in-

tercourse with 'one of another nation,' and persisted in that belief, until sent by express command to Cornelius. And what was this but the force of early prejudice, which taught the Jew, as it taught the Norwich episcopalian, to view his own sect with a proudly exclusive feeling?

Soon after these events, a parcel of tracts sent by a lady, first awakened in Charlotte Elizabeth's mind the desire to become an author. She accordingly sat down one evening, at seven o'clock, continued her new task until three in the morning, when she found she had completed a little story, 'in the progress of which I had been enabled so to set forth the truth as it is in Jesus, that on reading it over, I was amazed at the statement I had made of Scriptural truth.' From henceforth, she became a regular contributor to the Dublin Tract Society; and this circumstance, by throwing her among the Orange party, strengthened still more prejudices, which rather required an opposite treatment. She now became acquainted with Dr. Hamilton and his lady, and that they were the worthy and truly Christian people which she represents, we have no doubt.

'His income was considerable; and while exercising the rites of a truly Irish hospitality on a noble scale, he expended a large proportion of that income in works of charity equally judicious, liberal, and impartial. He had under his roof thirteen poor girls, who were educated, maintained, taught in all the requisites of good household servants, and finally placed out in the families of his friends. Mrs. Hamilton seemed to have her heart in this school, over which a very competent mistress presided, and a more beautifully ordered little nursery of valuable domestics I never saw. Besides this, large benefactions were distributed in clothing, fuel, and other necessaries, among the poor of the parish, without any regard to religious distinction; and as the Romanists amounted to above twelve hundred, while the Protestants could not muster one, and the former were infinitely more necessitous than the latter, of course nearly all went to them. I dwell upon these things and upon the exceeding kind-heartedness of the good clergyman and his affectionate partner towards their poor neighbours, because it throws additional light on the real origin of those acts which the English people were made to believe resulted from oppression on the part of the Protestant clergy.'—pp. 137, 138.

Now how came it not to occur to Charlotte Elizabeth that the twelve hundred Roman Catholics 'infinitely more necessitous' than the scarcely one hundred Protestants, could not avoid viewing with hostility a rector who took the tithes which they considered as the due of their own priest, in full, and threw them back a mere fraction of their own property in the alms of turf and blankets? We think if Scriptural knowledge, too, had exercised its full effect on her mind, she would have

perceived that a rich living obtained from a parish where twelve to one rejected the clergyman's ministrations, was scarcely a following out of the principle, 'Do unto others as ye would they should do unto you.'

The political and religious differences which convulsed Ireland during the years 1824 and 1825 added fuel to the flame of Charlotte Elizabeth's wrath against Popery, while she began, unconsciously it appears, to take up millenarian opinions, and to feel a vehement interest in the future state of the Jews. The following is her confession of faith on the subject:

'I believe Popery to be the Babylon of the Apocalypse, and I longed for resolution to proclaim to the deluded victims, 'Come out of her, my people.' This I had never done, but on the contrary, fell cheerfully in with the then cautious policy of my friends, and so framed my little books and tracts as to leave it doubtful whether they were written by a Protestant or not. Paul to the Jews became as a Jew, that he might gain the Jews: I, by a false process of reason, thought it allowable to become as an idolator to the idolators, that I might gain the idolators. An awfully presumptuous sin! The Jew possesses the fair blossom of gospel truth, which by kindly fostering is to be expanded and ripened into the rich fruit: the Papist holds in his hand an apple of Sodom, beneath the painted rind of which is a mass of ashes and corruption. He must be induced to fling it away, and to pluck from the tree of life a wholly different thing.'—p. 142.

This is strange, but after it, we are scarcely surprized to find her characterizing Popery, as worse than idolatry. If this be the case, how can she persist in using her Prayer-Book? two thirds of which are derived from this 'worse than idolatrous' service. The anti-tithe war, waged at this time in Ireland, she informs us was a grand Satanic device. Indeed, it is curious in her case to observe how closely 'extremes meet,' for in her anxiety to summon Satanic agency to account for whatever falls out contrary to her preconceived notions, she unconsciously treads on Papist ground; and in her account of a dumb boy, whom she took under her care, and educated, we are again and again reminded in his 'beautiful notions,' of some of the most amusing monkish legends.

Soon after, Charlotte Elizabeth returned to England, and rejoined her brother, from whom she had been separated nine years. And here, we feel we can scarcely award sufficient commendation to the simple and touching manner in which, in a few lines, she passes over the record of injuries and sorrows which a Madame Laffarge, and unhappily some others, would have exhibited to the world in at least one hundred pages of letter-press, duly adorned with dashes and notes of admiration. Would that that Christian principle which taught Charlotte

Elizabeth so nobly to pass over wrongs, of all others most irritating to woman, had also taught her that, in religious controversy, 'the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God.' But unfortunately, on her return to England, she became an associate of the British Reformation Society; and her 'no popery' principles from henceforth seem to have become a kind of monomania. The doctrine of Protestant hatred, which the members of that amiable society have certainly laboured hard to exemplify, is thus set forth:—

'It was one of the great commendations of the church at Ephesus that they hated the deeds of the Nicolaitanes, which Christ also hates: and let us daub over our sinful indifference as we may, with the false varnish of liberality, charity, and so forth, it will be an awful item against our souls if we do not hate, actively hate, the deeds of Antichristian Rome; and prove it by exposing the vile snare that we may deliver those whom it holds in captivity. We have frittered away God's truth, and well nigh trampled out his line of demarcation, between a holy worship and the polluted sacrifice of an idol temple, while speculating on the fair front of Jansenism as opposed to Jesuitism: we have turned from the fires of Smithfield to contemplate the well-told tales of Port-Royal, and thrust our Bradfords, our Latimers, yea and our Luthers from the shelf to set up Fenelon and à Kempis. To their own Master they stood or fell; Fenelon's appointed work was the conversion of Protestants to Popery: he used all the influence of his very superior mind and amiable character to draw the persecuted Huguenots into communion with Rome. It was his glory that he succeeded so far, and no doubt he did it conscientiously; but so long as I read in my Bible that Satan transforms himself *into an angel of light* to seduce Christ's servants from their allegiance to HIM, I will not tamper with my faith by sitting down to ascertain how much of Christianity I can discover in certain individuals actively promoting a system against which the God of heaven has pronounced an irrevocable, a withering, and a final curse.'—pp. 192, 193.

Is the writer of this paragraph prepared to assert, that such men as St. Anselm, St. Bernard, and Peter Lombard, were servants of Satan? That the writer of the magnificent '*Dies Iræ*,' and those many exquisite hymns which the sternest protestant might willingly join in singing, were men 'actively engaged promoting a system against which God has pronounced an irrevocable curse?' Of what use is discrimination, if the members of a whole communion, holding many different views, although they did not actually leave her pale, are to be in this wholesale way 'delivered over to Satan?'

The thirteenth letter is entitled 'National Apostasy,' and begins, with all the emphasis of capitals, 'EIGHTEEN HUNDRED AND TWENTY-NINE had arrived,' the year in which catholic emancipation was granted. It commences with a short sketch of

ecclesiastical history, which shows at least the writer's utter ignorance. She tells us that the Gospel had been preached here very early, and that the church then formed had continued, —small, indeed, but scriptural,—until the time of 'the Romish delegate, Augustine,' who prevailed 'more by the lances of despotic monarchs than through the willing assent of Britons, lay or ecclesiastical.' So that, in opposition to all authentic history, the mission of Augustine, it appears, was not to convert ferocious heathens to the Christian faith, but to preach popery to a protestant church of the seventh century! We, albeit neither papists nor episcopalians, willingly hold to the historic fact, that Augustine, moved with pity for the idolatrous Saxons, quitted a civilized people and a city that enshrined all the learning of the western world, to preach, at the peril of his life, those great truths which Williams but as yesterday sought to preach at Rarotonga.

'For ever hallowed be that morning fair!
Blest be the unconscious shores on which ye tread!
And blest the silver cross which ye, instead
Of martial banner, in procession bear!
They come, and onward travel without dread,
Chanting in barbarous ears a holy prayer.
Rich conquest over minds which they would free,
Awaits their coming; the tempestuous sea
Of ignorance, that ran so rough and high,
And heeded not the voice of clashing swords,
These good men humble by a few bare words,
And calm with fear of God's divinity.'*

We are next told how England lay at the pope's feet until Henry VIII. arose, and how 'the blessed interval of young Edward's reign' gave the church peace and the land prosperity! An opinion which even Fox's Book of Martyrs would not corroborate. The system of Dr. Croly is followed in the account of the following reigns; and it is shown, how persecuting the papists was ever made, by Divine appointment, the means of England's advancement,—a comfortable doctrine to the rich pluralists of the Irish church, but rather difficult, we should think, to reconcile with Scripture. With these views, as the time drew on, Charlotte Elizabeth fasted with her family, 'introduced a separate supplication into the family devotions, purchased parchments, and wrote petitions, and sent about for signatures.' She also procured 'a large number of simple tracts, explaining, on scriptural grounds, the dreadful nature of popery,' that thus, as she innocently remarks, 'the people might judge for themselves.' An excellent method, certainly, of judging one side of the question.

* Wordsworth.

'A schoolmaster, who held the old principles dear as his very life was secretly lamenting the coming evil, without a hope of being permitted in any way to oppose it; and you may believe with what delight he responded to my call, when asked to assist me. He went round to those who had previously received the little tracts, and to some of the small hamlets, or clusters of cottages scattered throughout the parish. He strictly adhered to my injunction to admit no signature of any youth under seventeen years; nor of any who did not seem to understand what they were doing, and why. I scattered the tracts and handbills as widely as I could: asked several intelligent men of an humble class to speak of it among their acquaintance: and at the end of the second day I had, not nineteen, but two hundred and forty-six signatures of honest sensible Englishmen to my petitions.

'The only person under the stipulated age who signed it was Jack: he was not seventeen; but he wept and implored so passionately for leave to tell the king not to let Romans make bad gods in England, that it would have been a sin to reject his protest. He rather cut than wrote his name on the parchment: the deepest crimson suffused his face, and his eyes flashed with the energy of his heartfelt protest against the abomination that he so well knew. He does not now regret it, while waiting for the summons to rejoice with the heavens, and the holy apostles and prophets, over the fall of Babylon the great.

'Our petition was presented to the Commons by the county member; to the Lords by the Bishop of London; and to the King by the noble, honest, protesting Duke of Newcastle. My zealous neighbour took them to London, and saw the first laid on the table, as he told me, with tears of thankfulness that he had been permitted to aid in the work.'—pp. 278, 279.

Now, in what point does all this differ from the methods adopted in papal countries to maintain the cause of the 'holy catholic church?'

The 'wicked bill,' however, passed both houses and received the royal assent; and from henceforth our national downfall, saith Charlotte Elizabeth, is inevitable. It was, therefore, some comfort, in the midst of this judgment, that millenarianism opened a bright prospect to her view, and she turned from the unbearable sight of papists in parliament to the battle of Armageddon, in which they, together with all heathens and schismatics, would be utterly destroyed,—a view which seems to have afforded remarkable consolation to her friend, Mr. M'Neile.

Whatever effect this doctrine had upon her feelings, on her muse the effect was certainly inspiring. Seldom, if ever, has millenarianism been celebrated in numbers of equal beauty.

'When from scattered lands afar
Speeds the voice of rumoured war,

Nations in conflicting pride
Heaved like Ocean's stormy tide,
When the solar splendors fail
And the crescent waxeth pale,
And the powers that star-like reign,
Sink dishonoured to the plain,
World, do thou the signal dread,
We exalt the drooping head,
We uplift the expectant eye—
Our redemption draweth nigh.

When the fig-tree shoots appear
Men proclaim their summer near;
When the hearts of rebels fail
We the coming Saviour hail;
Bridegroom of the weeping spouse,
Listen to her longing vows—
Listen to her widow'd moan,
Listen to creation's groan!
Bid, oh bid, the trumpet sound,
Gather thine elect around;
Gird with saints thy flaming car,
Gather them from climes afar,
Call them from life's cheerless gloom,
Call them from the marble tomb,
From the grass-grown village grave,
From the deep dissolving wave,
From the whirlwind and the flame,
Mighty Head! thy members claim!

Where are those whose fierce disdain
Scorn'd Messiah's gentle reign?
Lo, in seas of sulph'rous fire
Now they taste his tardy ire,
Prison'd till th' appointed day
When the world shall pass away.'

There is a strange fierceness about millenarianism; and its views seem even to have increased Charlotte Elizabeth's intolerance. Indeed the moral influence of its doctrines has, with many, we think, been too much lost sight of. How can a system which looks to a general massacre as the means of evangelizing the world, harmonize with a faith that teaches love to God and love to man as the sum and substance of the whole?

In the advocacy of millenarianism, and the denunciation of popery,—and, of late, of Puseyism, which Charlotte Elizabeth considers as a just judgment on the land for admitting papists to power,—the later efforts of her pen, chiefly as editor of a well-known monthly periodical, have consisted. Her abuse of the

last-mentioned system is actually amusing; because, to plant her most determined blows, she is compelled to stand on dissenting ground.

It is with very contradictory feelings we lay down this little volume; our respect for the writer's excellencies is so counterbalanced by our sorrow that she should have been led actually to injure the cause of protestantism by the violent and unjust statements she has put forth. When we remember how extensive her usefulness as a religious writer might have been, had she contented herself with simple and gentle scriptural statements, instead of becoming well nigh the Pythoness of the band of millenarian prophets, we cannot, indeed, too much regret that she should thus

> 'Narrow her mind,
> And for party give up what was meant for mankind.'

Art. V. *Lays of Ancient Rome.* By Thomas Babington Macaulay. 8vo. London: Longman. 1842.

Till the beginning of the present century, the history of Rome, by the great mass of classical scholars, was taken as a whole, just as it had come down from antiquity. The flight of Tarquin the Proud was no more questioned than that of Antony from Actium. Nay, not merely the prominent facts, but the very details of individual prowess were gravely and unhesitatingly cited; and if anything of a secular character, and in no way linking in with the old heathen superstitions, was accounted fabulous or fabulised, it was rather instinctively, and at the bidding of common sense, than as the result of a conscious train of reasoning. James Perizonius, a celebrated Dutch critic, had indeed, in 1685, suggested the probable extent of interpolation, and pointed out a source whence the apocryphal narrative might be derived; but till the publication of Niebuhr's work on Roman history, his hypothesis found few followers. Niebuhr, who tells us that when his lectures were originally published, he was unaware of the prior discovery of Perizonius, may certainly claim all the honour due to its annunciation in modern times. Indeed, he first put it forth as a complete theory, and in so doing, has been, we think, tempted to generalise too fast, and infer too much. His doctrine in its latest modification is substantially this:—that we have no trustworthy narrative of what took place for three hundred years after the foundation of the city; that the fabulous history of ballads alone survived its destruction by the Gauls; that the annalists and compilers of chronicles who then sprung up, did

little else than set down the tale as they received it (a complete change at that epoch in the form and matter of Latin poetry favouring its passage into prose), and that the Augustan historians had no earlier or better authorities than the chronicles so put together for the accounts which they have sent down to us. Now there are many errors, many palpable inconsistencies, in the earlier annals of the Imperial City; but we cannot wonder at this. The wonder would be, that a people ever more addicted to war than to peace, struggling sometimes for existence, and always for supremacy, should have an accurate record of their first fortunes. Those fortunes to the eyes of the living generation would be in perpetual ebb and flow. To day they might depend on this instance of individual daring or endurance, to-morrow on that; and as the present need seems ever the most urgent, the present deliverance the most surpassing, there would be much fickleness and uncertainty in the popular estimation of merit, and much variance in the tale committed to popular tradition. In the nature of things, a plain true unvarnished account is not to be expected. How would a speculative man prize the story of the growth of his own mind, yet he never longs for such a record without a sense of the hopelessness of his wish. The spirit of a man in the frame and with the external life of a child, would indeed make a wondrous revelation; but even fancy has no power to realize such a condition of being: self love, uncertain recollection, and a judgment biassed in a thousand ways, known and unknown, would all pervert a retrospective narrative of five years, much more of twenty or of fifty. This truth and its application to national history are obvious enough.

A full investigation of the theory of Niebuhr and Perizonius is far beyond our limits; but in brief, we may say that of the existence of ballad poetry, poetry that is in the form of familiar narrative, among the ancient Romans, there can be no question. Apart from incidental allusions by other authors to the practice, Cicero expressly states,* on the authority of Cato the Censor, that it was the custom among the forefathers of his generation to sing in turns at banquets the praises and exploits of illustrious men, and he himself laments† that those songs were in his own day lost. In another place he makes the remarkable avowal,‡

* Tusc. Disp. IV. 2. † Brutus XIX.

‡ Ipsæ enim familiæ sua quasi ornamenta, ac monumenta servabant, et ad usum si quis ejusdem generis occidisset, et ad memoriam laudum domesticarum et ad illustrandam nobilitatem suam: quamquam his laudationibus historia rerum nostrarum est facta mendosior. Multa enim scripta sunt in eis, quæ non facta sunt, falsi triumphi, plures consulatus, genera etiam falsa.—Brut. XVI. Yet Cicero, at the close of this very paragraph, speaks unhesitatingly of certain persons being consuls in the tenth year after the expulsion of the kings.

that in the records of the patrician houses, there were imaginary exploits, fictitious triumphs, exaggerated honours, and fabulous genealogies, so that by these ancestral eulogies, which we know it was the practice to rehearse in the ears of the people at the funerals of the nobles, the history of past times was becoming increasingly uncertain. When, besides all this, we find that the early annals of Rome are much more poetical, and abound much more in singular and improbable incident than those of any after period, the main inference of Niebuhr is fair enough. It would be idle to demand in such a case proof as conclusive as for a mathematical proposition. It could not be given, and is obviously not needed.

Mr. Macaulay, in his very interesting preface to the volume before us, has given the principal arguments in support of the theory, and presented them in a much more lucid and culminating form than Niebuhr,* though he seems unwilling to press it to the same extremity of historic scepticism.

'Perhaps the theory of Perizonius cannot be better illustrated than by showing that what he supposes to have taken place in ancient times has, beyond all doubt, taken place in modern times.

''History,' says Hume, with the utmost gravity, 'has preserved some instances of Edgar's amours, from which, as from a specimen, we may form a conjecture of the rest.' He then tells very agreeably the stories of Elfleda and Elfrida—two stories which have a most suspicious air of romance, and which, indeed, greatly resemble in their general character some of the legends of early Rome. He cites, as his authority for these two tales, the chronicle of William of Malmesbury, who lived in the time of King Stephen. The great majority of readers suppose that the device by which Elfleda was substituted for her young mistress, the artifice by which Athelwold obtained the hand of Elfrida, the detection of that artifice, the hunting party, and the vengeance of the amorous king, are things about which there is no more doubt than about the execution of Anne Boleyn, or the slitting of Sir John Coventry's nose. But when we turn to William of Malmesbury, we

* We must, however, remark that the testimony of Horace is considerably overstated. Mr. Macaulay generalizes it into—'The Romans will, over their full goblets, sing to the pipe, after the fashion of their fathers, the deeds of brave captains and the ancient legends, touching the origin of the city.' To the ordinary reader, especially as it closes the array of authorities, this will seem conclusive; but in Horace there is no such check upon belief as 'legends,' and not one word about 'the origin of the city.' He speaks of Troy, and Anchises, and Eneas; and Eneas, we are told, founded Lavinium, but Rome was not in existence till long after.

'Virtute functos, more patrum, duces
Lydis remixto carmine tibiis
Trojamque, et Anchisen, et almæ
Progeniem Veneris canemus.'

find that Hume, in his eagerness to relate these pleasant fables, has overlooked one very important circumstance. William does indeed tell both the stories; but he gives us distinct notice that he does not warrant their truth, and that they rest on no better authority than that of ballads. . . . . .

'Thus we find inserted, as unquestionable facts, in a narrative which is likely to last as long as the English tongue, the inventions of some minstrel whose works were probably never committed to writing, whose name is buried in oblivion, and whose dialect has become obsolete. It must, then, be admitted to be possible, or rather highly probable, that the stories of Romulus and Remus, and of the Horatii and Curiatii, may have had a similar origin.'—pp. 31, 33.

This conclusion we do not altogether dispute, but the cases are hardly parallel. There is nothing so violently improbable in that part of the story of Horatii with which *history* has most to do. To three champions might be committed the sovereignty or slavery of Rome, and indeed, such a selection by threes seems to have been a very ancient practice. The chief among David's mighty men are so reckoned. And, to a Roman, the story of Romulus and Remus was something more than a fable or a doubtful tale; it had the gravity and implicitness of a religious faith mingled with it. Niebuhr admits, that in the year of the city 458, bronze figures of the she wolf and babes were set up by the state near the Ficus Ruminalis. Surely, then, Livy must have held a tradition which had been so recognised and sanctioned in more than conventional belief. But Hume introduces the account of Elfrida as a lively episode, a piece of court scandal, and, whether true or false, of no historical importance. He would not have recorded the murder of Beckett, or the battle of Barnet, on no better authority than might have served for Fair Rosamond or Jane Shore.

There is a curious instance on record of the mode in which falsehood finds its way into history, of quite recent date. It has been confidently affirmed, that in Lord Howe's victory of the 1st of June, 1794, the crew of the *Vengeur*, a French ship of the line, though all her masts were shot away, and she was sinking, refused to strike; that they hung out 'every rag of tricolor which would run on rope,' and fired furiously from the upper deck when the lower was under water; and that, finally, with one fierce shout of *Vive la République!* on their lips, they went down. Mr. Alison, in his 'History of the French Revolution,' told the story, nothing doubting; so, too, did Mr. Carlyle, in his own peculiar way, in his:—and but just in time to draw out a refutation of it from Admiral Griffiths, who was fourth lieutenant of one of the ships which engaged the *Vengeur*. The Admiral denied the whole account, specially asserting that the *Vengeur* surrendered some

time before she sunk, and that instead of a unanimous and indignant rejection of life at the hands of the victors, her Captain, M. Renaudin, and several hundreds of her crew, were brought prisoners of war to England.

Mr. Carlyle, after diligent inquiries here and in Paris, published the result of them and his own retraction of the story. On the other side of the channel a vehement newspaper tirade was the consequence, and in the course of the dispute, some one, loving France much we suppose, but truth more, or perhaps not altogether aware of what he was about, printed from the Archives of the French Admiralty the dispatch of Captain Renaudin, (attested by seven other official signatures) to the Minister of Marine. One paragraph ran thus:—'Those of our comrades who remained on board the *Vengeur*, with hands lifted to heaven and lamentable cries, implored the succour for which they could no longer hope. Very soon the vessel and the unhappy victims it contained disappeared. In the midst of the horror with which this dreadful scene inspired us all, we could not help feeling admiration, mingled with grief, for we heard, as we sailed away, SOME of our comrades forming vows for their country. The last cry of these unhappy men was, '*Vive la République!*' They died in pronouncing it.' That part of the tale which has to do with firing so long as a foot of plank lay above the waves, was at first told of the *Terrible*, a vessel supposed to have gone down in the fight, but which it turned out had escaped into Brest. Of the *Terrible*, therefore, it could no longer be affirmed, and so, as the fable was too much to the purpose to be lost, and as there is no lie so like truth as the lie circumstantial, it was fastened upon the *Vengeur*, by Barrère, who electrified the Convention with it eight days after the battle; but who, though living, remained obstinately, we cannot say unaccountably, silent when the fact came at length to be called in question. Such, says Mr. Carlyle,* 'is this same *glorieuse affaire du Vengeur*, in which truly much courage was manifested, but no unparalleled courage, except that of Barrère, in his report of 21st Messidor, year II. That a son of Adam should venture on constructing so majestic a piece of *blague* and hang it out dexterously, like the earth itself, on nothing, to be believed and venerated by twenty-five million sons of Adam for such a length of time, the basis of it all the while being simply Zero and Nonentity —there is in this a greatness, nay, a kind of sublimity, that strikes us silent, as if 'the Infinite disclosed itself,' and we had a glimpse of the ancient reign of Chaos and Nox! Miraculous Mahomet, Apolonius with the Golden Thigh, Mendez Pinto, Munchausen, Cagliostro, Psalmanazar, seem but botchers in comparison.'

* Fraser's Magazine, July 1839.

Here then we have, in spite of living witnesses to its falsity, a tale which was, for forty years, universally credited; a tale, on the authority of which, solemn legislative decrees were passed; a tale which Chénier and Le Brun long ago versified; a tale which did find its way into two elaborate histories; and of which there is, after all, more than an even chance that it is commended to the faith and admiration of posterity in the French annals. Yet we contend that, for all purposes of history, it is as good as true. No one at the time questioned its possibility or its likelihood. It was an instance of the untameable spirit of republicanism which was then abroad; such, indeed, as no one could have foreseen, but which, when alleged, surprised no one. Defiance had been flung in the face of death, in the selfsame words, far too often for that. Now we do not say that the stories of Clœlia and Horatius are true, but we do affirm that to call the Roman History of three centuries a fable, on their, or on like account, is about the same thing as asserting, because the tale of the *Vengeur* is, to speak transatlantically, an 'almighty lie,' that the battle off Brest was never fought, or that possibly it may have been, but that Howe and Villaret Joyeuse were mere fabulous commanders.

The fact is, that not all Niebuhr's profound scholarship could save him from being theory-smitten. He was a German; and a German setting out in all hardihood and faith that he shall find his way over chaos in the right direction, does not seldom, by the help of what may there be drifting, make the transit; but then it is a hundred to one he insists, not that a solitary passenger now and then may do the same, but that, like Milton's Sin and Death, he has beaten out a broad highway for whole armies. Niebuhr would seem to have come to regard as something more than suspicious all which we are told happened before the first Punic war, or certainly before the siege by the Gauls, yet it is by no means clear where he himself draws the line between the credible and incredible, for he sometimes speaks of the story of the kings as 'evidently and necessarily based on an historic foundation such as exists in free narrative,' and presently calls it a 'mythic' relation, a 'Tarquinian epopee,' and expresses his admiration of 'the sublime genius who invented it,' affirming, moreover, that Livy 'tells the tale as a history, without meaning it for one; with no feeling of doubt, yet without conviction.' One of the closing remarks of his sixteenth chapter seems to have suggested to Mr. Macaulay the idea of the present work. Its original reference, doubtless, is to an edition of the earlier books of Livy in conjectural Saturnian verse, for he tells us that the fine tact and poetical bent of that historian have led him instinctively to separate the pure gold of the old ballads from the baser metal in the chronicles which he consulted, and gives, as a re-presentation in its original form, the threat of Sextus to Lucretia, thus—

'Tace Lucretia, Sextus | Tarquinius sum ;
Ferrum in manu est ; moriere | si emiseri vocem.'

which is either Augustan prose or anteobsidian verse.

'With Lucius Tarquinius, commences a great poem, which terminates with the battle at Regillus. . . . It divides itself, in a way foreign to the unity of the most perfect poem of Greece, into sections, which correspond with the 'Adventures' in the Lay of the Niebelungen, and *if any one had the boldness to attempt restoring it as a poem*, he would greatly fail if he selected any other than its present magnificent form.'

Mr. Macaulay accordingly proposes in these 'Lays of Ancient Rome' to reverse the process by which its lost ballads are supposed to have been transformed into history, to throw some of the incidents which we find in Livy and Dionysius into the poetic form which they originally bore ; and taking into account the difficulty of seeing with the eyes and speaking with the tongue of twenty-five centuries ago, we think he has been eminently successful.

Horatius Cocles, we are told, when the city was surprised by the Etruscan armies under Porsena, maintained almost alone the pass on the farther side of the Tiber, while the bridge was being broken down behind him, and then, to the astonishment of friends and foes, flung himself, armed as he was, into the river, and swam safely across. 'We have beaten the Romans,' said the baffled Etrurians, 'but Horatius has conquered us!'* This is the subject of the first 'Lay.' The effects of the gathering of the Tuscan cities against Rome are thus set forth :—

'Tall are the oaks whose acorns
Drop in dark Auser's rill;
Fat are the stags that champ the boughs
Of the Ciminian hill;
Beyond all streams Clitumnus
Is to the herdsman dear;
Best of all pools the fowler loves
The great Volsinian mere.

But now no stroke of woodman
Is heard by Auser's rill;
No hunter tracks the stag's green path
Up the Ciminian hill;
Unwatched along Clitumnus
Grazes the milk-white steer;
Unharmed the water fowl may dip
In the Volsinian mere.

* Val. Max. iii. c. 2.

The harvests of Arretium,
This year, old men shall reap;
This year, young boys in Umbro
Shall plunge the struggling sheep;
And in the vats of Luna,
This year, the must shall foam
Round the white feet of laughing girls,
Whose sires have marched to Rome.'—pp. 49, 50.

There is airiness and graceful imagery in this description, and it heightens by contrast the after stir and strife, but it is not in character. With such a theme no one of the nation marked out in prophecy as 'dreadful and terrible,' would have lingered near rivers or in forests, or by the wine-press. The spirit of the three hundred triumphs was on it from the first. How well Mr. Macaulay can show this, our readers shall judge for themselves. Here are lines from another of the Lays in the right key.

'Then tenfold round the body
The roar of battle rose,
Like the roar of a burning forest,
When a strong northwind blows.
Now backward, and now forward,
Rocked furiously the fray,
Till none could see Valerius,
And none wist where he lay.
For shivered arms and ensigns
Were heaped there in a mound,
And corpses stiff, and dying men
That writhed and gnawed the ground;
And wounded horses kicking,
And snorting purple foam:
Right well did such a couch befit
A Consular of Rome.'—p. 113.

Selection is difficult where there are no breaks in the story, but we give the close of the defence of the bridge.

'But meanwhile axe and lever
Have manfully been plied;
And now the bridge hangs tottering
Above the boiling tide.
'Come back, come back, Horatius!'
Loud cried the Fathers all.
'Back, Lartius! back, Herminius!
Back, ere the ruin fall!'

Back darted Spurius Lartius;
Herminius darted back:
And, as they passed, beneath their feet
They felt the timbers crack.

But when they turned their faces,
And on the farther shore
Saw brave Horatius stand alone,
They would have crossed once more.

But with a crash like thunder
Fell every loosened beam,
And, like a dam, the mighty wreck
Lay right athwart the stream:
And a long shout of triumph
Rose from the walls of Rome,
As to the highest turret-tops
Was splashed the yellow foam.

And, like a horse unbroken
When first he feels the rein,
The furious river struggled hard,
And tossed his tawny mane;
And burst the curb, and bounded,
Rejoicing to be free;
And whirling down, in fierce career,
Battlement, and plank, and pier,
Rushed headlong to the sea.

Alone stood brave Horatius,
But constant still in mind;
Thrice thirty thousand foes before,
And the broad flood behind.
'Down with him!' cried false Sextus,
With a smile on his pale face.
'Now yield thee,' cried Lars Porsena,
'Now yield thee to our grace.'

Round turned he, as not deigning
Those craven ranks to see;
Nought spake he to Lars Porsena,
To Sextus nought spake he;
But he saw on Palatinus
The white porch of his home;
And he spake to the noble river
That rolls by the towers of Rome—

'Oh, Tiber! father Tiber!
To whom the Romans pray,
A Roman's life, a Roman's arms,
Take thou in charge this day!'
So he spake, and speaking sheathed
The good sword by his side,
And, with his harness on his back,
Plunged headlong in the tide.

No sound of joy or sorrow
Was heard from either bank;
But friends and foes in dumb surprise,
With parted lips and straining eyes,
Stood gazing where he sank;
And when above the surges
They saw his crest appear,
All Rome sent forth a rapturous cry,
And even the ranks of Tuscany
Could scarce forbear to cheer.

But fiercely ran the current,
Swollen high by months of rain:
And fast his blood was flowing;
And he was sore in pain,
And heavy with his armour,
And spent with changing blows:
And oft they thought him sinking,
But still again he rose.

Never, I ween, did swimmer,
In such an evil case,
Struggle through such a raging flood
Safe to the landing place:
But his limbs were borne up bravely
By the brave heart within,
And our good father Tiber
Bare bravely up his chin.'—pp. 69—73.

From the second poem, 'the Battle of Regillus,' in which the gods Castor and Pollux were said to have appeared in the crisis of the fight and led the Romans to the charge, we should like to quote largely, but must content ourselves with the following citation:—

'Forth with a shout sprang Titus,
And seized black Auster's rein.
Then Aulus sware a fearful oath,
And ran at him amain.
'The furies of thy brother
With me and mine abide,
If one of your accursed house
Upon black Auster ride!'
As on an Alpine watch-tower
From heaven comes down the flame,
Full on the neck of Titus
The blade of Aulus came:
And out the red blood spouted,
In a wide arch and tall,
As spouts a fountain in the court
Of some rich Capuan's hall.

The knees of all the Latines
Were loosened with dismay
When dead, on dead Herminius,
The bravest Tarquin lay.

And Aulus the Dictator
Stroked Auster's raven mane,
With heed he looked unto the girths,
With heed unto the rein.
'Now bear me well, black Auster,
Into yon thick array;
And thou and I will have revenge
For thy good lord this day.'

So spake he; and was buckling
Tighter black Auster's band,
When he was aware of a princely pair
That rode at his right hand.
So like they were, no mortal
Might one from other know:
White as snow their armour was:
Their steeds were white as snow.
Never on earthly anvil
Did such rare armour gleam;
And never did such gallant steeds
Drink of an earthly stream.

And all who saw them trembled,
And pale grew every cheek;
And Aulus the Dictator
Scarce gathered voice to speak.
'Say by what name men call you?
What city is your home?
And wherefore ride ye in such guise
Before the ranks of Rome?'

'By many names men call us;
In many lands we dwell:
Well Samothracia knows us;
Cyrene knows us well.
Our house in gay Tarentum
Is hung each morn with flowers:
High o'er the masts of Syracuse
Our marble portal towers:
But by the proud Eurotas
Is our dear native home;
And for the right we come to fight
Before the ranks of Rome.'

So answered those strange horsemen,
And each couched low his spear;

And forthwith all the ranks of Rome
Were bold, and of good cheer:
And on the thirty armies
Came wonder and affright,
And Ardea wavered on the left,
And Cora on the right.
'Rome to the charge!' cried Aulus;
'The foe begins to yield!
Charge for the hearth of Vesta!
Charge for the Golden Shield!
Let no man stop to plunder,
But slay, and slay, and slay:
The Gods who live for ever
Are on our side to day.'

Then the fierce trumpet flourish
From earth to heaven arose,
The kites know well the long stern swell
That bids the Romans close.
Then the good sword of Aulus
Was lifted up to slay:
Then, like a crag down Apennine,
Rush'd Auster through the fray.
But under those strange horsemen
Still thicker lay the slain;
And after those strange horses
Black Auster toiled in vain.
Behind them Rome's long battle
Came rolling on the foe,
Ensigns dancing wild above,
Blades all in line below.
So comes the Po in flood-time
Upon the Celtic plain:
So comes the squall, blacker than night,
Upon the Adrian main.
Now, by our Sire Quirinus,
It was a goodly sight
To see the thirty standards
Swept down the tide of flight.'—pp. 120—124.

The story of Virginia we presume is familar to all our readers. It has supplied Mr. Macaulay with the subject of the third of these Lays. We can only give the catastrophe.

'Hard by, a flesher on a block had laid his whittle down:
Virginius caught the whittle up, and hid it in his gown.
And then his eyes grew very dim, and his throat began to swell,
And in a hoarse, changed voice he spake, 'Farewell, sweet child!
Farewell!
Oh! how I loved my darling! Though stern I sometimes be,

To thee, thou know'st, I was not so. Who could be so to thee?
And how my darling loved me! How glad she was to hear
My footstep on the threshold when I came back last year!
And how she danced with pleasure to see my civic crown,
And took my sword, and hung it up, and brought me forth my gown!
Now, all those things are over—yes, all thy pretty ways,
Thy needlework, thy prattle, thy snatches of old lays;
And none will grieve when I go forth, or smile when I return,
Or watch beside the old man's bed, or weep upon his urn.
The house that was the happiest within the Roman walls,
The house that envied not the wealth of Capua's marble halls,
Now, for the brightness of thy smile, must have eternal gloom,
And for the music of thy voice, the silence of the tomb.
The time is come. See how he points his eager hand this way!
See how his eyes gloat on thy grief, like a kite's upon the prey!
With all his wit, he little deems, that, spurned, betrayed, bereft,
Thy father hath in his despair one fearful refuge left.
He little deems that in this hand I clutch what still can save
Thy gentle youth from taunts and blows, the portion of the slave;
Yea, and from nameless evil, that passeth taunt and blow—
Foul outrage which thou know'st not, which thou shalt never know.
Then clasp me round the neck once more, and give me one more kiss;
And now, mine own dear little girl, there is no way but this.'
With that he lifted high the steel, and smote her in the side,
And in her blood she sank to earth, and with one sob she died.

* * * * * * *

When Appius Claudius saw that deed, he shuddered and sank down,
And hid his face some little space with the corner of his gown,
Till, with white lips and bloodshot eyes, Virginius tottered nigh,
And stood before the judgment-seat, and held the knife on high.
'Oh! dwellers in the nether gloom, avengers of the slain,
By this dear blood I cry to you, do right between us twain;
And even as Appius Claudius hath dealt by me and mine,
Deal you by Appius Claudius and all the Claudian line!'
So spake the slayer of his child, and turned, and went his way;
But first he cast one haggard glance to where the body lay,
And writhed, and groaned a fearful groan, and then with steadfast feet,
Strode right across the market-place unto the Sacred Street.'

pp. 158—160.

The lingering tenderness, deepening into the sternness of despair, in the words of Virginius is well, but the comparison, 'as a kite upon the prey,' is a blemish. No father, in the agony of such a resolve, would make it.

The last Lay, the 'Prophecy of Capys,' is more the offspring of the imagination, and therefore more ideally complete than the others. The vengeance of Romulus and Remus, and the future dominion of the City of the Seven Hills, are its themes; but our licence of extract is already exceeded.

We do not admire such epithets as 'pale waves,' and '*ivory* moonlight;' nor think that the Dioscuri would of old have been represented as saying, 'For the *right* we come to fight;' nor conceive that in the Year of the City 450, a Roman with the Tiber at his feet, and the Tyrrhene sea on the horizon, would have gone some two hundred miles across the Apennines for a simile from the Po and the Adriatic. Oversights of this sort it is true there are, but we regard these Lays as considerably in advance of such of the earlier poems of Mr. Macaulay as we have seen, and hope to meet with works of a like character from him again. Battles, indeed, and feats of arms, have a sameness which, in spite of gorgeous accompaniments and skilful grouping, soon becomes wearisome, but in ancient and modern annals may be found fit subjects for verse in all possible variety. There could scarcely be a greater civil gift to a nation than a score or two of historical ballads, spirited but brief, and such as might become freemen.

Art. VI. 1. *Newfoundland in* 1842. *A Sequel to* '*The Canadas in* 1841.' By Sir Richard Henry Bonnycastle, Knt., Lieut.-Col. in the Corps of Royal Engineers. London: Colburn.

2. *Excursions in and about Newfoundland, during the Years* 1839 *and* 1840. By J. B. Jukes, M.A., F.G.S., F.C.P.S., of St. John's College, Cambridge, late Geological Surveyor of Newfoundland. In 2 vols. London: John Murray.

THE most neglected portion of the British dominions, and the least known, is, by the force of circumstances, and the course of events, drawn from its obscurity and brought into a position which commands attention and awakens inquiry. This is Newfoundland—the oldest of our colonies, and the nearest to our shores. Both Mr. Jukes and Sir Richard Henry Bonnycastle concur in regarding the present as the commencement of a new era in the political and commercial history of Newfoundland, as the key of transatlantic Britain, the emigrant's home a thousand miles nearer to his native land than any other of our colonies, and the source of wealth to all who may make it the scene of enterprise, or who may choose to embark capital in its trade.

Sebastian Cabot, a Venetian born, who in his infancy was carried by his parents to England, and became the most celebrated navigator of his day, was the discoverer of Newfoundland. He sailed from England in the spring of 1497, five years after Columbus had seen the West Indies, to penetrate by a north-western route to China and the Spice Islands. On an ancient map deposited in the Privy Gallery at Whitehall, is given the narrative of the discovery in Latin, which is thus translated in the Hackluyt Collection:—'In the year of our Lord

1749, John Cabot, a Venetian, and his son Sebastian, with an English fleet, set out from Bristol, and discovered that land which no man before that time had attempted, on the twenty-fourth of June, about five of the clock, early in the morning. This land he called *Primavista*, that is to say, first seen, because as I suppose, it was that part whereof they had the first sight from sea. That island, which lieth out before the land, he called of St. John, upon this occasion, as I thinke, because it was discovered upon the day of John the Baptist. The inhabitants of this island used to wear beasts skinnes, and have them in as great estimation as we have our finest garments. In their wars they use bowes, arrows, pikes, darts, wooden clubs, and slings. The soil is barren in some places, and yieldeth little fruit, but it is full of white bears and stagges, far greater than ours. It yieldeth plenty of fish, and those very great, as seales; there are soles also above a yard in length, but especially there is a great abundance of that kind of fish which the savages call baccalaos (codfish). In the same island also there breed hawks, but they are so blacke that they are very like to ravens, as also their partridges and eagles, which are in like sort, blacke.' Furs and fish, the skins of the seales, codfish for food, and whales for oil, become irresistible attractions to European cupidity and enterprise. But the human aborigines—the red Indians—or, as the narrative calls them, 'the savages,' were driven into the woods and to places of security untrodden by other feet than their own, where they obtained a precarious subsistence, and where they not unfrequently perished with hunger. By their merciless invaders they were accused of treachery, but they were the first deceived; and of cruelty, when they were, indeed, not its perpetrators but its victims. At length, compelled to practise deceit, and to murder in their own defence, they were branded as atrocious criminals, and shared the fate of the wolf and the bird of prey. Happily their misery is ended, the sufferings of centuries have terminated. The race, it is believed, is now extinct. The guilt rests somewhere, and must be accounted for another day.

To Sir Richard Bonnycastle we are indebted for all that is properly history in the modern publications on the subject of Newfoundland. With great industry and patience of research, he has brought together and woven into a consistent narrative portions of information which he found scattered through many scarce and antiquated volumes. We pass over the interval between 1497 and 1583, though the narrative is not without interest. It was on the fifth of August, 1583, that Sir Humphrey Gilbert, the brother-in-law of Sir Walter Raleigh, took formal possession of Newfoundland, in the name of his sovereign mis-

tress. The English laws, constitution, and *church government*, were established, whilst it was made penal for anybody to attempt anything prejudicial to the newly-acquired dominion; and amongst other enactments, it was declared that any persons uttering words 'to the dishonour of her Majesty,' should lose his ears. We find in the times of James I., a patent for Newfoundland and the plantation thereof made by the English in 1610, delivered in a letter dated thence from M. Guy to M. Slaney, treating also of the weather of the three first winters, and of Captain Weston, with other remarkable occurrents. This expedition was upon a large scale, and was promoted by M. Guy, a Bristol merchant, who published several pamphlets, and obtained the patronage and assistance of Sir Francis Bacon, Lord Northampton, and Sir Francis Tanfield, to whom, with forty associates, a patent was then granted, styling them 'The Treasurer and Company of Adventurers and Planters of the Cities of London and Bristol, for the Colony and Plantation of Newfoundland.'

Their territory was declared to reach from Cape Bonavista to Cape St. Mary; and they were even invested with the royal rights of the precious metals, and the entire property of the land, soil, and mines, with viceregal powers of the most extended nature; and in short, the only important reservation was that the fisheries should be open to all British subjects, but all the seas and islands within ten miles of the coast, from N. L. forty-six degrees to fifty-two degrees, were declared to be in their dominion.

During a period of ninety years, from the first attempt at settlement, misrule reared its head, and society was in a wretched condition. This was produced by the absurd policy of the government at home, which discouraged settlement by every means in its power. Those who, in spite of this policy, sought a permanent residence in the colony, were brought in perpetual collision with the merchant adventurers. 'The struggle,' Sir Richard Bonnycastle observes, 'was not so much of a political nature as it was one of mere personal interests, and it arose chiefly from the unlimited discretion and licence of the illiterate masters of vessels, and from the constant desire of the resident population to appropriate the best *ships' rooms*, as the places for packing and drying the fish in the harbours were then and are still called.' About the year 1696 war raged with all its horrors in this devoted island, and the governments of France and England seemed both determined to fight to the uttermost for supremacy respecting its possession; and until the peace of Utretcht in 1713, it was torn and harassed by petty warfare and depredation, being sometimes in the possession of one power, sometimes in that of the other. By this celebrated treaty, Newfoundland and the

adjacent islands were declared to belong in exclusive sovereignty to Great Britain. Unfortunately, however, liberty was granted to the French fishermen to catch and dry fish on two-thirds of the eastern shores, the whole of the northern, and one-third of the western, in the Gulf of St. Lawrence; but they were not allowed to build or to settle. This grant on the part of England was generous, but most impolitic. It is remarkable that during this troubled period the population of Newfoundland greatly increased, and colonization made rapid strides under every disadvantage, whilst the fisheries were carried on very briskly after the peace by both French and English.

At this time the island was under the nominal administration of the governor of Nova Scotia; but delegated power, to be exercised by mercenaries and underlings at a distance, is generally employed, not in maintaining, but in violating justice. The colonists bitterly felt this to be the case; but it was not till the year 1728 that they were established as a separate colony of Great Britain, with the appointment from home of a civil governor. Their first governor was a naval officer, Captain Henry Osborne, who must have been a person of no mean talents, as he afterwards obtained the thanks of the House of Commons, and on his retirement a pension of 1200*l.* a-year during his life.

The appointment of a governor, and one eminently qualified to discharge the functions of his office, was not all that was required either for the peace or the prosperity of the island. While the principle of the parent legislature was avowedly to discountenance all settlement and local civilization,—to prevent in fact a possession of great capabilities from rising to anything above a mere place for fishing,—it was impossible for the civil authorities to maintain order and enforce the laws, when they had to contend against what we may call the maritime staff, consisting of the fishing admirals, and their more unlettered and frequently tyrannical associates, the masters of the fishing ships. As our author observes, there were 'two kings of Brentford,' two powers diametrically opposed to each other, and equally sanctioned by the laws which had been passed for the regulation of the colony. A succession of naval governors followed Captain Osborne, and many severe reverses of fortune the island experienced from war, from misrule, famine, and from internal dissensions. A blow, which was fatal to their prosperity, and from which they have not even now entirely recovered, was struck at them by one of the first acts of Congress at the commencement of the American war. This was a decree which informed the British nation that they, the Congress, 'had suspended all intercourse of trade by importation, and that unless their grievances were redressed, they would likewise discountenance their exports to her possessions.'

This measure was carried out against the unoffending Newfoundlanders on the seventeenth of May, 1775, and was horribly effectual. The year 1775 was remarkable as having been the era of distress of another kind, arising from natural causes; one of the most severe storms which ever assailed the island and its neighbouring banks, caused the destruction of hundreds of fishing boats and numbers of large vessels, and not fewer than three hundred men perished. The sea rose, as it is said, suddenly twenty feet above its usual level, and overwhelmed the land as well as the harbours, carrying destruction in its course.

The brief notices of governors are perhaps necessary as links of a chain; but some are, of course, more interesting than others. Coming down as far as the year 1797, we read with pleasure that 'Admiral Waldegrave, afterwards Lord Radstock, rendered his administration remarkable by his zeal for the public welfare, by his strenuous efforts to counteract the insidious and hateful poison which 'Paine's Age of Reason,' and 'The Rights of Man,' were working in the small, and not very educated community he ruled over, and by his munificent and careful protection of the interests of religion, and the due administration of the laws. He built a new church, patronized the formation of schools, and left a name lasting in the memories of those disposed to perpetuate good government, morality, and order.'

The name of Admiral Gambier occurs, who was appointed to the government of Newfoundland in 1802, and of whom it is recorded that he promoted the interests of the colony to the utmost of his power, fostered the education of the people, and obtained the character of a mild and equitable man.'

Notwithstanding the excellent character of many of the governors, and the judicious measures which distinguished their administration, and though civilization made considerable advances, down to the year 1818 it could be truly affirmed that there had been no instance of a British colony so inadequately provided for in the administration of its internal affairs as Newfoundland. A new era began to dawn under the auspices of Sir Charles Hamilton, the first permanently resident civil governor.

In the year 1826, under Sir Thomas Cochrane, the first civil governor who was not at the same time the admiral commanding the Newfoundland station, a royal charter, the first efficient one of the kind, was issued, by which a most important and salutary change in the administration of justice was effected. In 1832, a representative assembly was granted, which placed Newfoundland on a par with the neighbouring provinces of Great Britain. Sir Thomas Cochrane, whose administration had conferred many advantages on the colony, was somewhat suddenly relieved

of office in 1834, by the appearance of a vessel of war bringing Captain Henry Prescott, of the Royal Navy, with a commission as civil governor, who found the colony flourishing in trade, but extremely difficult to manage. Liberal institutions, abruptly displacing long established tyranny, for a season appear to produce more evil than good. Men must be trained to the use of freedom before they can enjoy it; while it is their duty to attain it, how and when they can: for though liberty may be abused, despotism is a curse that none but abject slaves will endure one moment longer than they are able successfully to resist it. There were several discordant elements at work in the social, as well as in the political state of Newfoundland, which, though they could not obstruct its growing prosperity, arising from its improved civilization and relative importance, yet contributed greatly to the disturbance of its tranquillity, by exciting the popular discontent and violence. Captain Prescott's reign lasted till the summer of 1840, and was passed amidst constant turmoil from the opposing interests of the House of Assembly and the council; the former adopting bills as thick as hail, and the latter rejecting the bills adopted by the former. The scenes described at the elections almost exceed credibility, and the troops were kept during those periods always ready to prevent or to check popular commotion, and altogether the country was in a state of agitation from one end to the other. Chief Justice Boulton, an acute and intelligent lawyer, in the course of his duty, sentenced several individuals to the gallows, and a warfare was kept up by the press against the Catholic priesthood, who were openly accused of controlling the elections. Religious feuds and party politics, though in themselves to be deprecated, are indications of popular freedom, and when left simply to the antagonism of argument and moral force, the inconveniences that attend them are abundantly compensated by the spirit of inquiry which they induce, the truths they elicit, and their influence in creating a public mind and keeping it in healthy exercise. Newfoundland expended her acrimonious feelings and party animosities in senseless clamour, but not for a moment did she relax her industry, or pause in her career of advancement. It must, however, be admitted, that Captain Prescott's administration was less efficient for good than that of his predecessor, as the roads which Sir Thomas Cochrane had so ably commenced were not continued, nor were the agricultural resources of the island developed.

Sir R. H. Bonnycastle speaks of the satisfaction which the appointment of the present governor, Sir John Harvey, afforded to the colony. It seems all classes of the Newfoundland subjects of her Majesty hailed his appearance as the forerunner of an end to the political and other disunion which had so unhap-

pily prevailed for some years past. 'They hailed it as the certainty that Newfoundland had now become one of the colonies of Great Britain; no longer a mere fishing station, but an important and effectual arm of the great power which occupies the foremost rank amidst the nations of the world.'

To impress this conviction upon the parent state, the author shews that Newfoundland is of immense commercial importance to this country—that this may be greatly increased—that it may be made a self-sustaining colony, a daily enlarging field for emigration and mercantile enterprise, and above all, he labours to prove that this island is, 'in fact, to British America what England is to Europe and to Asia — the sea-girt fortress in which the destinies of those immense and wonderful regions must hereafter be regulated and controlled;' and in triumphant conclusion he asserts, 'so long as our time-honoured flag floats over the ocean, so long will Newfoundland remain as a second Britain to North America.'

Sir R. H. Bonnycastle enters into details which prove that the importance of the trade of Newfoundland to Britain, even in its present depreciated condition, is beyond the commonly received ideas of it. By examination of public documents he says, 'It is clear beyond a doubt, that in the year just gone past, upwards of a thousand sail of good-sized vessels entered, and upwards of nine hundred and fifty left the harbours and ports of Newfoundland, without taking into consideration the innumerable schooners and small craft engaged in the actual fisheries.' Again, he observes, 'Without fatiguing the reader, however, with details, we shall briefly state that Newfoundland employs annually fifteen hundred sail of merchantmen, conveying 140,000 tons of produce, employing more than thirty thousand sailors, and all, with few exceptions, fitted out by British capital. These vessels convey the staple to Great Britain, Guernsey and Jersey, the West Indies, British North America, to the United States of America, to Foreign Europe, to Madeira, the Azores, Brazil, Gibraltar, the Mediterranean, &c.'

The following is important, and is suggestive as to the policy which the mother country ought to adopt in her future government of this colony which was once entirely her own. Any hope of her regaining the full possession of it, which she once enjoyed, must be vain; yet something may be done by a judicious system of colonization, which will not fail to give a great preponderance to British trade and commerce. But let us hear Sir Richard Bonnycastle:—

'Had Newfoundland possessed a vigorous maritime population at the close of the last general war, sufficiently numerous to have set their invaders at defiance, both in skill and means, we should not now see the fishery on the banks employing only a dozen or so of small island

or British vessels, where a thousand formerly rode in triumph. Now the voyager passes through a forest of French, Spanish, and American vessels there, but he in vain looks for the time-honoured flag of England. The foreigners have literally driven us ashore, and thus undersell us in the catholic countries, in every part of the world, which we formerly supplied, whilst the French add the inducement of bounties, and have made Newfoundland the 'Nursery of their Seamen!'*

'Formerly, the island, in return for the outlay of the mother country, took all its imports from her, her manufactured goods, her home and colonial produce—in short, everything except a few trifling luxuries; and in return for these benefits, valued in the most palmy state of Newfoundland at no less a sum than a million and a half sterling, she sent Britain two millions.

'Now, Newfoundland imports much of her subsistence from Hamburgh and from Boston, or New York; whilst the Americans, with their right of fishing on the banks, have also nearly a fourth of the island coast allotted to them, to dry the fish caught on that coast, monopolize the herring fishery off the Magdalen Islands in our own dominion, or, as they would style it, in our own waters, intrude into the great salmon rivers of Labrador, kill our seals, and with their national carelessness about rights, drive our unprotected fishermen there from their own grounds.

'The French occupy more than half the island shores, engross the grand bank, and laugh us to scorn. Once a year, or thereabouts, a little schooner armed to the teeth, displays the national flag in our harbour of St. John's, to see how things are getting on with us, and an active, jealous guard is kept up by similarly armed vessels, with an occasional frigate, over the coast they occupy; and it was even judged most judicious to send a son of the King of France, in the Belle Poule, to visit the stations.'—Vol. ii., pp. 171—173.

How is this state of things to be remedied? Sir R. H. Bonnycastle suggests what he thinks cannot fail of success.

'The greater the population of Newfoundland as a British colony, the greater will be the extent of settled shore,—is as clear as the solution of the fourth proposition of Euclid, and no such distant nations as the French and the Spaniards, who now rival and beat us in the bank fishery—no, not even the Americans—could occupy those banks on such easy and favourable terms as a people could living close aboard of them. I look to the extension of agriculture in Newfoundland as a primary means of restoring the fishery trade to Great Britain—a trade which has been so depreciated of late years, owing to the length of the peace, and other concurrent causes.'—Ib., p. 170.

In order to ascertain the capabilities of the island, to reward the industry, and amply to sustain an emigrant population that

* Still, such is the seaman nature of Britons, there are not fewer than 10,000 real and prime sailors in the cod and seal fishery of Newfoundland and Labrador.

might take up their abode in its prairies and wildernesses, and wherever the means of obtaining a settlement can be created, Mr. Jukes made his 'excursions,' and Sir R. H. Bonnycastle pursued his inquiries, and collected the materials of the present volumes. The results of both are favourable, though Sir R. Bonnycastle does not hesitate to aver, that on certain points he entertains views different from those of Mr. Jukes, and that he demurs at some of his conclusions. For instance:—

'The island of Newfoundland is divided by Mr. Juke into two sections, which, in the map accompanying this work, would be shewn by a line drawn from Cape Ray, the south-western angle of the island, to the head of the Bay of Exploits, on the north-eastern central shore.

'On the south of that line, all, he says, 'from Dan to Beersheba,' is hopeless and barren; whilst to the north of it there is a land of promise, not flowing with milk and honey, but abounding in forest and fell, in coal and iron, in limestone and gypseous deposits; in short, granite and infertile rocks are the sole productions of the desolation which this writer attributes to one-half of this splendid island, and his misgivings are great about his visions of the other.

'I fear, or rather, I hope, that Mr. Jukes has been, as most young authors are, a little too hasty in this generalization, and that whenever the British government may be induced to patronize discovery, much will be found in the interior or central portion, as well as in the south-eastern half, thus somewhat hastily condemned to ever-during sterility, which will not only be fitted for agricultural purposes, but develop likewise mineral treasures and resources; for many of the formations in which these exist elsewhere have been also seen here.'—Vol. i., pp. 185, 186.

We have great faith in the judgment of Sir Richard Bonnycastle, and believe him when he says,—

'Whenever the south-west coast of Newfoundland and its vast interior shall be opened to the emigrant, he will find ample employment, and reap ample returns from making its soil assistant to the great purposes of the fisheries. Then—that is, as soon as agriculture lifts its head—the island will no longer be behind its sister colonies in comfort; and the prices we now quote will soon and rapidly approximate, in articles of necessity as well as luxury, to those of Canada.'—Vol. ii., pp. 187, 188.

And again,—

'Beyond all, I think the settlement of the western coast, and the probability of a new capital arising either in St. George's or some of the adjoining bays, which would supply the eastern city and shores with coal, iron, building stone, bricks, marble, and timber for house or ship building, and perhaps also with grain and ordinary fruits, would tend more to raise the dormant interest of the mother country, and give the people of St. John's new energies, than anything else that could be attempted.

'Colonize the western shores, and Newfoundland will then have several other important interests besides the mere shore fishery; and the conjunction will not only develop all her vast resources, but will open out a new and virgin field for commercial enterprise; and the British merchant will soon prove, as he has proved everywhere else under the glorious flag of his fatherland, that mere local politics are but as shadows, when compared with the power and pre-eminence of that country of which all the colonies are vital members, of which every subject is a son, who can proudly assert, I, too, am a Briton,' 'I am a Canadian,' 'I am a Newfoundlander,' and 'I love my natal soil beyond every other, but I will never consent to be the less a Briton.' Such are the feelings of every descendant of the Englishman, the Scotchman, and the Irishman, in every colony of that monarchy on which the light of day never ceases to shine.'—Ib., p. 157.

That Newfoundland affords undoubted evidence of a capability for agricultural pursuits, we learn from the speech of the present governor, Sir John Harvey, delivered by him at the first agricultural meeting held at St. John's, on the 14th of January of the last year. The cause of which, he says,—

'Without entering into speculations regarding a subject with which we are, as yet, imperfectly acquainted, but upon which it will be the duty of the executive government, through the aid of the provincial legislature, to acquire more accurate information—I mean the adaptation, or otherwise, of the extensive prairies of the interior of the island, for cultivation and settlement,—it may be sufficient for my present purpose merely to advert to a fact which is within the knowledge of you all—viz., that this island, throughout almost the whole extent of its bays, harbours, and inlets, is skirted by a belt of cultivable land, varying in depth, from one to several leagues, well calculated to reward the labours of the agriculturist, of which no more convincing proof can be required than the specimens of produce now before you, consisting of wheat, barley, oats, turnips, potatoes, &c., equal in size, in weight, and in quality, to the productions of any other country, England not excepted! It may be asked (elsewhere), 'How is this to be explained with reference to the reputed sterility of the soil of Newfoundland, and to the length and severity of its winters, and the consequent shortness of its open season?' The answer is, 'By the productive qualities of that soil to which the imputation of sterility so unjustly attaches; by the fineness of its autumnal season, which affords ample opportunity for the preparation of the ground for the 'spring crops;' and by the almost unexampled rapidity of vegetation during the summer, by which the shortness of that season is amply compensated.' I repeat then, to you, gentlemen, what I have so frequently said in two neighbouring colonies: 'The results of your harvests may, under the blessing of that Providence upon which they must in all countries alike depend, be ensured, as far as they can be by human means, by a provident industry, aided by a system of agriculture adapted to the climate and soil of the island.'

'This observation conducts me to the more immediate objects of our meeting, and to the position in which I stand before you, as the patron of an association, upon the formation of which I offer you and the colony my most cordial congratulations; believing, as I firmly do, that the objects which that association has in view are not only reconcilable, but identified, with all its other interests, more especially those of its merchants and fishermen; and that, in proportion as they are successfully carried out, they must have the effect of advancing and promoting those interests to an extent to which it is not possible to assign any limitation.'—Vol. i., pp. 170—172.

But it is time we should give some account of the works before us. The personal adventures and engagements of Mr. Jukes are more properly the subject of his volumes than Newfoundland. Whatever of real value they contain, and that has for its object the benefit of the colony, is much more fully exhibited in the work of Sir Richard Bonnycastle.

As our readers have seen, the first part of 'Newfoundland in 1842,' is devoted to its Political and General History. Part the Second includes under the head 'Natural History,—Geology and geological relations. Animal kingdom; first division—quadrupeds, whales, birds. Second division—amphibia, fishes. Third division—insects, mollusca, crustacea, arachnides, annulata, and zoophytes. Vegetable kingdom—plants. The Third Part treats on Physical History, and includes climate and meteorology.

The second volume commences with the agricultural resources of Newfoundland. Part the Fourth illustrates its Moral History—its moral and physical relations, government and polity; religion, manners, and customs of the people. Political Economy forms the fifth part, embracing the fisheries, trade, shipping, and revenue. Modern Geography and Topography is the concluding portion of the work, which presents us with the existing aspect of the island, its divisions, roads, public works, and brief notices of the now extinct Aborigines, the Red Indians. The subjects, all of them of deep interest to the parent country, to the colony, and to the general reader, who may desire to obtain information, if not profoundly, are sufficiently treated. Comprehensive views, patient investigation, and lucid arrangement, are the chief characteristics of this, as of Sir Richard Bonnycastle's former work, to which the present is an appropriate sequel.

There is one source of discord to which Sir Richard very obscurely alludes, that has already produced heart-burnings and fierce contentions, which continues to throw a blight on all the fruits of Christian peace and virtue, and which, some day or other, will shake the colony to its foundations; and that is, the

exclusive establishment of an endowed national church, a protestant episcopacy, to be supported by a population, two-thirds of whom cannot belong to its communion, and who have to maintain their own clergy, and provide their own places of worship. This is the curse of British protection and British rule. It is the vine of Sodom. By what indignant hands will it be rooted up? If this vile tyranny is not the grave—and there is comfort in the thought—it will be the cradle of freedom. Ecclesiastical power, in its last efforts to enthral the world, will be the means of setting it free.

Art. VII. *The Rural and Domestic Life of Germany, with Characteristic Sketches of its Cities and Scenery, collected in a General Tour, and during a residence in the Country in the Years* 1840—42. By W. Howitt. *With above* 50 *Illustrations.* By G. F. Sargent. London: Longman and Co.

We are glad again to meet Mr. Howitt on his own ground. Always an agreeable and instructive companion, he is pre-eminently so, when walking amidst the beauties and calming influences of nature. Exquisitely susceptible of her charms, he possesses the happy faculty of transmitting a portion of his enthusiasm to others; —both to the young, whose ardour is yet uncooled, and to the more thoughtful of those whom the commerce of life has withdrawn from pursuits in which they formerly delighted. We know no writer who has retained, in so healthful a degree, the fresh and vivid impressions of early life, or whose whole soul pours itself out in such unsophisticated admiration of the familiar but unrivalled beauties of nature. In the present volume he has sought to do, in reference to Germany, what former productions of his prolific pen have accomplished in relation to England, and a happy measure of success has attended the effort. The scene was new, and the groupings, both of character and natural scenery, were novel, notwithstanding the many publications on Germany which, for some years past, have been given to the English public. Much has been written respecting our German neighbours, their philosophy, scholarship, and rationalism, yet much remained to be told, and of this no inconsiderable portion is supplied in the volume before us. We could have dispensed with those chapters of the work which relate to German cities, so far at least as their public buildings, theatres, and historical associations are concerned. These topics have been handled by other writers, and their omission by Mr. Howitt would have diminished the bulk without materially lessening the value of the volume. Some other portions of the work might have been advantageously compressed, and, as warm friends of the author, we counsel him to

be on his guard against a tendency to diffuseness, which is occasionally observable in his writings.

The first chapter is devoted to *First Impressions*, in which the peculiar character of the country, and the contrast of its features to those of England, are set forth. 'It is only,' as Mr. Howitt justly remarks, 'in the first moments in which you witness something which is entirely new to you, that you feel that novelty in all its vividness, and perceive really how widely divided is the nature and aspect of what you then contemplate from the objects of your former knowledge!' A prompt record of impressions is therefore as essential to an accurate exhibition of such a subject, as extensive knowledge, or a sound and discriminating judgment. A practical mind, conversant with other scenes, accustomed to look on other phases of character, and to mingle with different forms of domestic life, is best qualified to succeed in such an undertaking. In German towns, 'all is quaint, old, still, and none of the sweetest. You see, as you land, plenty of solemn custom-house officers, in half-military dress, and well mustachioed. As you proceed through the streets, you find around you gabled and picturesque white buildings, old squares and markets, with avenues of limes or of dwarf acacias; people, many of them in the garb of centuries ago, and dreadful pavements.' The general appearance of the country is far from rivalling that of England, as the following extract will show:—

'Here you look in vain for anything like the green fields and hedgerows of England, with their scattered trees, groups of beautiful cattle, or flocks grazing in peace, and sweet cottages, farm-houses, and beautiful mansions of the gentry. It is all one fenceless and ploughed field. Long rows of trees on each side of the road are all that divide them from the fields, and in the south these are generally fruit trees. The beauty of Germany lies only, or with few exceptions, amongst its hills. There, its woods, and green valleys, and clear streams, are beautiful; but from one region of hills to another extend only huge and open plains, marked with the road-side lines of trees. The population is not scattered along, as in England, over hill and dale, in groups and single residences, of various grades and degrees of interest; while the luxuriant fences, the meadows and uplands charming with grass and flowers, old, half-hidden lanes, and trees standing here and there of the noblest size, and in the freedom of natural beauty, make the plainest part of the country enchanting. All here is open and bald; the people are collected into villages of the most prosaic kind, and no gentry reside amongst them. In fact, what we call country life in England is here unknown.

'For ourselves, we became at once struck with this as we drove over the plain from Mannheim to Heidelberg. There is no part of Germany where the open plains are more richly cultivated, and which, with their way-side fruit trees, have a more clothed appearance, but even here

how striking was the difference to the country in England! As there is one general character of country, of towns, of manners, and appearances, throughout Germany, we shall here confine ourselves, where we are dealing with generals, to the neighbourhood of Heidelberg, for the reason given above, and afterwards, in various parts, point out specific differences and variations.

'Far and wide the country, without a single fence, covered with corn and vegetables, as seen from the heights which bounded it, presented a most singular appearance to an English eye. Its predominating colour, at that time of the year, was that of ripening corn, but of different hues, according to its different degrees of ripeness, and the different kinds of grain. This is not planted in those vast expanses which you see in the corn-farms of Northumberland and Lincolnshire, but in innumerable small patches and narrow stripes, because belonging to many different proprietors. Some is also sown in one direction, and some in another, with patches of potatoes, mangel-wurzel, kidney-beans, etc., amongst it, so that it presented to the eye the appearance of one of those straw table-mats of different colours which one has seen.

'Here and there you saw villages lying in the midst of the corn plain, and large woods, but not a hedge, and few scattered trees; the long rows of those marking out the highways being the only dividing lines of the country. As we passed these trees, we observed that they were principally apple, pear, plum, cherry, and walnut trees. One could not help feeling how these trees would be plundered in England, being set, as it were, by the very road, for that purpose; and indeed here, thorns fastened round the boles, and stuck between the branches of the cherry trees, where the fruit was ripening, spoke clearly of marauders. Fruit of all kinds was in abundance, and the heavy crops that are common here were indicated by the contrivances to prevent the branches being rent off. Some had their main branches held together by strong wooden clamps, others were propped with various poles; others, especially the plum trees, had their boughs tied up, and supported by ropes of chesnut bark. Some of these slips of bark were so low that mischievous urchins, if so disposed, could easily have cut them.

'We passed through several of the dorfs, or villages. They had a primitive, heavy, and thoroughly agricultural air. The houses are built of stone, large, and heavy, and each having a great round-headed gateway, leading into a sort of inner court, or farm-yard. We observed numbers of women at work in the fields, without shoes, stockings, bonnets, or caps. They were healthy, contented, sun-burnt creatures, many of them picturesque enough for any painter of primitive life.'—pp. 6—8.

In his second and third chapters Mr. Howitt takes us into the villages, woods, and valleys of Germany, and the vividness and picturesque character of his descriptions go far to familiarize us with the condition and habits of the people. He laments, with thorough English taste, over the manner in which the cows are

worked, and the utter absence from German rural life of 'the knowing and social rook.' Referring to the latter, he says, 'you never see large flocks of rooks sailing homeward in the evening, full, and uttering their satisfaction in a quiet caw, now and then, as their dusky legions pass over your head. . . . He is neither loved, known, nor wanted there, for he would grub up the springing corn in quest of his prey, and would find none of the grand old pastoral meadows he finds in England to supply his demand for slugs and worms.'

The following description of the valley of Peter will afford our readers a not uninteresting glimpse into German country life.

'It is one of those innumerable valleys in Germany lying amongst the hills, which swarm with human life, and present one of the most picturesque, lively scenes of German industry—industry still in the midst of quiet, and surrounded by the slumber of mighty woods. It is a long and winding valley, having very little breadth in the bottom, and yet enough for a clear stream to bound along, and hollow watermeadows of the richest green to slope down on each side, and numbers of ancient-looking water-mills to be seated upon it; and cottages to be scattered in one continual string for miles all along the foot of the hills on both sides. These mills are largish buildings in the true heavy style, with large farm-yards attached; plenty of heaps and great piles of fire-wood; old mill-stones and old waggons lying or standing about. The millers are generally the most substantial men of the place. They, some of of them, manufacture flour, and some oil from the rape and linseed, the poppy-head, and walnuts of the country; and the bumping sound of their stampers—beams moved by the machinery perpendicularly, and by the cogs of the wheels raised and let fall on the seeds placed in flannel bags in a proper receptacle below, is one of the most characteristic sounds of these valleys. Often at a distance, when buried in the woods, you can find the direction of a village by the sleepy sound of these bumpers. These mills, and the cottages, stand amid a world of old fruit trees, which, in autumn, are so loaded that they are obliged to be propped and tied up. In all directions, on the hill sides, extend their cultivated fields, full of their crops of corn, and vegetables of various kinds; their little vineyards often shew their trellised plots, and all above extends the thick and shady region of forest.

'Everywhere in these valleys you see the people busy in their possessions. Men and women and children are at work in the fields. Down the hills come women and children from the woods, carrying on their heads loads of fuel, or dragging great bundles of boughs down the narrow hollow ways after them. Others are cutting grass for the pent-up cattle; women are mowing much oftener than the men. Below are groups of women, with bare legs, washing by the clear stream. Quantities of linen are spread out to dry and to bleach; and round the houses are stalking plenty of fowls, while a large dog barks at you from his kennel as you pass the mill, or little poodles, with cock-a-

side tails, bark at you from the cottages, and geese clap their wings and clangour in the brook.

'This Petersthal is a great place for bleaching and washing, and all along lay the white patches of linen on the green meadow grass, and groups of the stoutest and most healthy-looking girls stood washing by the doors as we passed; while numbers of children ran about, many of them with nothing more than a shirt on. Here was one holding two cows by a rope tied to the horns, to graze by the wayside, and here another holding a goat. It was harvest time, and hot weather. The women were cutting their harvest, the men being gone to the greater harvest of the plain.

'The catholic character of the valley was obvious by the little images of the Virgin in niches in the front of the cottages as we passed. These images are of the most wretched kind; little things of gaudily-coloured plaster, bought of the wandering Italian dealers. But at the head of the glen stood a little chapel, which is a perfect specimen of what you find so commonly in catholic districts, at once indicating so much devotion and so much poverty. This little chapel had a very simple and ancient appearance, standing at the head of that retired glen, and surrounded by the solemn woods.'—pp. 36—38.

The German peasantry are, to a great extent, the proprietors of the soil. The country is parcelled out amongst them, 'and, wherever you go, instead of the great halls, the vast parks, and the broad lands of the nobility and gentry, as in England, you see the perpetual evidences of an agrarian system.' The effect of this, upon the general condition of the people—though not so simple a question as some persons imagine—is unquestionably good. Habits of industry and thriftiness are formed, independence of spirit is cherished, and the relationships of social life, so frequently disregarded amongst ourselves, are fostered and clung to. 'The German peasants work hard, but they have no actual want. Every man has his house, his orchard, his road-side trees, as we have seen commonly, so hung with fruit, that he is obliged to prop and secure them all ways, or they would be torn to pieces. He has his corn plot, his plot for mangel-wurzel, for hemp, and so on. He is his own master; and he and every member of his family have the strongest motives to labour. You see the effect of this in that unremitting diligence which is beyond that of the whole world besides, and his economy, which is still greater.'

Chapters IV. to IX. inclusive are devoted to what our author terms *Out-of-door Life*, and contain many things that are novel, and still more that will be interesting to the English reader. The pastoral life of the people, their sports and religious festivals, are all passed under review, and exhibit a condition of society vastly different from that of England. There is much in the following sketch which we should like to see transferred to our own people;—

'But we must come to the great and prominent out-of-door life of Germany. It is not then in their riding, fishing, hunting, or in such public games as racing, cricketing, rowing, &c.; but in the enjoyment of walking, of public gardens, of coffee and wine-drinking in such places, and above all, in open-air concerts. The enjoyment of music and social pleasures in the open air is the grand summer enjoyment of Germany. It is the universal passion from one end of the country to the other. It is the same in every village, in every town, in every capital. Public walks, public music, caffées and cassinos, coffee and wine-drinking, and smoking and knitting under trees, call out the whole population, high and low, great and small, old and young; and there does not seem a care from Berlin to Strassburg, from Cologne to Pesth. Nay, much as the French live out of doors, the Germans far excel them in this species of life. All their musical art is called forth, and their greatest masters are employed, to give a charm to this mode of social existence. Every means is adopted to give facility to the enjoyment of this taste. The heart of the Germans, too, is bound to the heart of nature with a deeper and holier feeling than that of the French. It is true that they have not that full and perfect and permanent country life that we have. The habits and institutions of their country do not allow it; but they have not less love of nature than we have, nor do they enjoy it less in their way than we do. Nay, in some respects they enjoy it far more, for they have taken measures to bring the beauty of nature to their very doors, to introduce it into the suburbs and the very heart of their towns, and to unite it to all the charms of art and of social life.'—pp. 77, 78.

As in other countries, so in Germany, the approach of spring is hailed with an enthusiasm to be known only when felt. The breaking up of the ice on the rivers is the great signal of its approach, for which all look with an intense and deepening interest as the period approaches. The boatmen are on the watch for it days before it occurs, and are able to discern the signs of its occurrence when less practised eyes see no intimation of a change. This breaking up of the ice in large rivers is a serious matter, especially in the neighbourhood of towns, where boats are crashed, mills destroyed, and bridges frequently carried away or greatly injured, by the tremendous blocks which come floating down the streams. Mr. Howitt was present on one of these occasions in the spring of 1840, and has given the following animated description of what he witnessed:—

'On the night then on which the boatmen had prognosticated the going of the ice, we were actually awoke by the swift galloping past of a horse, and the loud cry of a man, 'The ice goes! the ice goes!' I leaped from my bed, struck a light, looked at my watch, and it was —just twelve! Throwing open a window which faced the river, the scene was most strange and striking. An hour before, when I lay down, all was silent; now there came a wild and awful sound of con-

tending elements through the darkness. Sounds of grinding, crushing, cracking, of rushing roaring waters, and the sweep of winds, bringing from above the heavy dull explosions of ice-masses. Along the banks flared hundreds of torches. The cries of human voices, those of men, women, and children, came on all sides. Guns were firing rapidly near the city. One could perceive, through the darkness, white and spectral masses moving on the waters, and then the rending of fresh sheets away as those rushed against them. Below, from the bridge, where the gigantic pieces were continually striking against the piers, came the dull and continued thunders of a distant battle.

'I hastily threw on my clothes and ran towards the city. A more picturesque scene is not imaginable. People were hastening from all quarters to the river side. As I drew near the city, I met a good-natured student running to give us the intelligence. He was in his long dressing-gown and a red cap, and made many apologies for showing himself in such dishabille. We turned down to the river bank, and proceeded under a wide-arched passage beneath a garden terrace. Before us flared a cresset fire, shewing the blackened vaults and shadowy pillars around us. It was like the passage through some bandit's cave. At every opening on the river banks stood throngs with torches and poles and anxious looks. Women called out of windows, and others with their clothes thrown on in haste equal to my own, and with their cloaks or gown-skirts thrown over their heads, were hurrying here and there. All was life, wakefulness, and animation. We made our way to the bridge, where, though the ice, considering that it was two feet thick, was moving off in as orderly a style as could be expected, yet it presented a striking spectacle. By the light of their torches we could see it hurrying along in huge platforms of many yards square, which came ever and anon with such concussions against the strong stone bridge, that it trembled beneath us. The grinding and rustling sound, and the whiteness of the ice-masses, as they chafed against each other in going along, and raised round their edges a snowy ridge, had a singular effect; but the scenes and the groups around were not less striking. Under old dingy archways, at whose feet rushed the vexed waters, at every opening from the city to the stream, on the bridge, and along the banks, were seen wild-looking throngs, made strikingly conspicuous by their torches. Above, by the collected glare of all the torches, might be dimly discerned the old dusky towers and gables of this picturesque town, and high around, the dim sides of the wooded mountains, silent and dusk. The ruins of the old castle too overlooked the busy river in majestic gloom and indifference, as if it felt that it had once had its times of stir and human excitement, but had long ago done with them, and had no more concern with man and the changes of the seasons, than to stand through all, a solemn monument of the past.'—pp. 97, 98.

In the XVth Chapter, entitled, '*Singular moral characteristics of the Germans, and Oddities of Etiquette*,' Mr. Howitt has grouped together some striking and anomalous features of the

people. 'They are at once domestic and formal, homely and precise; they are an odd mixture of feeling and caution, moral strictness and freedom of manners. They are sentimental and religious, yet they have little regard to the Sunday. Shops and theatres are open; business, dancing, singing, and drinking at public-houses go on, the latter more briskly on this day than on most others; yet they dare not introduce an ecclesiastical character into an odd charade in social company, lest they should hurt the religious prejudices of somebody present.' The waltz, as is well known, had its origin in Germany, and is still the everlasting amusement of all classes and ages, yet, strange to say, 'these same German damsels who waltz and spin away for whole nights together with young men whom they never saw before, would be dreadfully shocked if one of these same young men, the day after, on setting out to take a public walk, in company with the father and mother and the whole family, or two or three families together, were to offer her his arm. Young people, unless they are formally betrothed to each other, never think of such a thing as walking arm in arm.' In their domestic relationships they are represented as kind-hearted and affectionate, forming the strongest attachments, and cherishing them through life. Their sensitiveness, however, is easily wounded, when they instantly enwrap themselves in that impenetrable stoicism which a German seems always to have at his command.

'It is in private social intercourse alone that the Germans display the genuine vivacity and heartiness of their character. In the social and select circle of approved and approving friends, they throw off all formality, and become as frolicsome and joyous as so many boys and girls. These same young men that in the street will go by you as swift as a steam-engine, and as dark as a thunder cloud, there become the very imps of mirth and jollity. They are ready to enter into any fun, to act any part,—to sing, to romp, to laugh, and quiz each other without mercy.

'They have indeed the faculty of becoming children, and even buffoons, without becoming ridiculous. They do not feel themselves foolish, and therefore don't become so. None but children in other countries can give themselves, body and soul, to the flow of their spirits, and throw themselves headlong, and yet with safety, into the whirlpool of active enjoyment. The grave Germans, strange as it may seem, can retain their boyhood and girlhood through life, and at any moment be as frolicsome, as artless, as noisy, as happy as children; yet without ever leaving go for an instant of the saving guidance of a manly discretion. The fact is, that they have a purity and elevation of moral feeling, which is at once their safety, their dignity, their honour, and their happiness. It is this which gives and preserves so much manly attachment in their friendships, so much propriety and endurance in their loves, so much confidence and esteem in their social intercourse.

'In similar circumstances, young men of other nations are apt to become impertinent and indecorous. We have heard English young ladies say, that in all the familiarities of waltzing and festive parties, the German gentlemen have never shown the slightest disposition to pass the bounds of the utmost delicacy. They have given none of those looks, those squeezes of the hand, and those private signals, which English young men are but too apt to allow themselves. Yet here, again, is another mark of the sensitiveness of the German character. These same young men, who, in a particular circle, will thus combine and be as gay and alert as grasshoppers, will, if one individual come in on whom they have not the same reliance, at once involve themselves in their cold formality, as a hedgehog, at the slightest approach of danger, wraps himself in his globe of spines, or as a snail retreats into its shell.

'We have seen a party of them act over the scenes of their Burschen life with a felicity of conception, of action, and of talent, that would have pleased even a London audience on the boards of one of our great theatres. A single person of their own nation and town, who has made himself notorious by his propensity to criticise and quiz, has appeared, and they have been suddenly paralysed and dispirited, and their proceedings have become a most miserable failure. It would be the most hopeless attempt to endeavour to engage them to be funny in any but their most approved circle; a thousand bugbears of ridiculous offence would start up before them, and daunt them past all power of action or desire to please.'—pp. 200, 201.

Mr. Howitt gives no very flattering account of the education of German ladies. He represents it as decidedly inferior to that of our own countrywomen, and their society as wanting in consequence the higher qualities which distinguish that of English ladies.

'The great defect of German female education is, that household and social accomplishments are made the sum of their instruction. The ladies of Germany, with many exceptions, are far below the English ladies, as desirable intellectual companions. Kinder or more attached and affectionate creatures cannot exist; but the good creatures must excuse me when I say, that they too often resemble kind, dear creatures in England, that one might pick up out of the class of our maids and housekeepers, with the exception of the knowledge of music and French, who would make very inadequate companions of our intellectual tastes and pursuits, though they might possess all other virtues under heaven. They are not instructed in the more solid parts of general learning. In history, in geography, in the wide field of the world of polite literature, in which our English ladies are as much at home as ourselves, they are far, far behind these ladies. They read indeed the romances and novels, and poetry, not only of their own country, but almost all the new novels of France, and England too, and truly, it must be confessed, show very little discrimination in their taste for these. Not only the works of Bulwer, Boz, Marryat,

James, &c., but the most trashy tales of our inferior writers, which are puffed in England, are immediately translated, or reprinted in Germany, and as much read by ladies and the devourers of circulating library pabulum, as they are at home. The men of any standing, from the cheapness of a university education, generally receive such a one, and, as if from jealousy, seem to have a mortal aversion to the ladies possessing the same sort of information as themselves. There is, accordingly, a great vacuum in German literature, which in England is filled by a host of productions which are equally read and relished by men and women, in which all matters of history, science, morals, and religion, are ably and profoundly, though not technically treated. German men are either writers of poetry and romance, or of strictly scientific and philosophical matters, and such things as female writers of first-rate eminence are extremely rare. A Caroline Pichler, a Gräfin Hahn-Hahn, a Bettina von Arnim, a daughter of Tieck translating Shakspeare, are rare exceptions. In fact, literary ladies are looked upon as a sort of petty monsters, and accordingly, such a series of fine-minded, and noble-minded, and glorious women as adorn the world of English literature, do not and cannot exist in Germany.'—pp. 234, 235.

We have marked for extract several passages pertaining to the literature and literati of Germany, but must restrict ourselves to the following account of Uhland, one of the first lyrical poets of his country. Uhland is a resident in Tübingen, 'an old fashioned university town,' where many of the most eminent men of Germany have been educated. Our author's account of him is as follows:—

'Like his town and townsmen, Uhland has somewhat of an old-world look. He has never travelled much from home; has a nervous manner, and that the more remarkable in a man who, as a member of the Würtemberg parliament, has distinguished himself as a bold speaker and maintainer of the most liberal principles. In consequence of his very liberal political creed, he has now withdrawn both from the chamber and from his professorship in the University, and possessing a competent fortune, devotes his life to life's happiest, and one of its most honourable pursuits, that of poetry. It has been said of him, by a witty townsman, that he is a genuine nightingale—to be heard and not seen. But this is a little too severe. Though somewhat plain in person, and fidgety in manner, these are things which are speedily forgotten in the enthusiasm of intellectual conversation. He lives in a house on the hill-side, overlooking the Neckar bridge, as you go out towards Ulm. Above lie his pleasant garden and vineyard, and hence he has a full view of the distant Swabian Alps, shutting in with their varied outlines one of the most rich, beautiful, and animated landscapes in that pleasant Swabian land. His wife, a bright-looking cheerful lady, came in from the garden with her work-basket, in which was an English edition of Milton's 'Paradise Lost,' which she had been reading. She appeared well used to society, and very well read and intel-

ligent. They have no children, but have adopted a very pretty sharp boy as their foster son. Uhland, indeed, appears to lead a happy and independent life here. Happy in his amiable and sensible wife, who highly admires his genius, and in the midst of his native scenes, to which, like all Swabians, he is much attached, and enjoying throughout Germany a high and firm reputation.

'Uhland has rarely attempted any poems of much length. His forte lies in lyrical harmony, and felicity of expressing the poetry of human life and of the national taste. Simplicity, elegance, and imaginative essence, eminently characterize his productions. In simplicity he often reminds you of Wordsworth in his small poems, as his 'Lucy Grey,' his 'Ruth,' his 'We are Seven,' &c.; but unlike Wordsworth, he is never metaphysical. The Germans have so much of metaphysics in cloudy, long-winded, and unintelligible prose, that they have a very natural abhorrence of it in poetry. Hence they cannot bear Wordsworth, and have little relish for more of Coleridge than his 'Ancient Mariner.' Uhland's 'Der Wirthin Töchterlein,'—the Landlady's Daughter,—is a perfect specimen of truest pathos in the extremest simplicity. It is set to music as purely simple, and is sung and played with enthusiasm all over Germany.

'Uhland has the rare art of saying much in few words, and these too, words of no pretence to startling or astonishing power; but they are the true servants of the imaginative faculty, and convey far more to the mind than to the ear or eye of the reader. He rejoices in all the amenities of the seasons and of nature. 'The Boy on the Hills,' 'The Shepherd's Sunday Song,' 'The Gardener's Song,' 'The Mild Day,' 'The Herd Boy,' 'The Churchyard in Spring,' 'The Songs in Spring,' 'The Gossamer,' 'The Lark,' 'May Dew,' 'The Poppy and Mallow in the Fields,' 'The Hunter's and Wanderer's Songs,' and numbers of such things, which in ordinary hands would be very ordinary affairs, are made to speak the sentiments of a heart and soul in fullest union with nature and with man. His Fatherland Songs are equally full of the spirit of patriotism. In every custom, ceremony, and feeling of social life, he is the representative of the popular feeling, in the happy and the sorrowful, the festive and the sober. The opening or the closing scenes of life; the garland of the bride, and of the funeral; the tears of separation and of perished love; the song of the poor man, and the triumphant lay of the victorious soldier,—all find their natural and their necessary place in his poetry. But where he seems even still more to be at home, is in the romantic regions of the Middle Ages. Almost all the striking characters of the old romances have a tribute, almost all their noblest incidents have received from his pencil new life and a new colouring.'—pp. 280—282.

Amongst the various places which he visited, we are glad to find that Mr. Howitt did not overlook Herrnhut, the celebrated settlement of the Moravians. The town is situated in Upper Lusatia, a few miles to the right of the great road from Dresden to Breslau, and was commenced in 1722. Mr. Howitt has de-

voted several pages to a description of the place and its inhabitants, which will be read with considerable interest by every friend of human improvement, and especially by the advocates of Christian missions. 'Amongst those places in the world,' remarks Mr. Howitt, and we partake of the feeling, 'which I have always had a desire to see, is Herrnhut; the original settlement in Saxony of those pious people whom we in England call Moravians, and whose wonderful devotion to missionary labours in all quarters of the world, and wonderful success in proportion to the smallness of their body, must have excited the admiration of all who have in the least regarded such matters.'

'Herrnhut itself is a neat, modern-looking little town, of about 1100 inhabitants. It is like most German modern towns, built with streets crossing at right angles, and of white houses. In a spacious square stand the little inn, the meeting-house, the single brethren's house, and other buildings belonging to the community. The single sisters' house stands also near, facing the lower end, or rather front of the church. Many private families live in their own separate houses. All is extremely neat, clean, and profoundly quiet. Few people are at any time seen going to and fro; and such a thing as a child playing in the street is not to be seen. In respect to education, they are very strict in their notions; and children, like John Wesley, are probably 'taught to fear the rod, and cry softly.' At all events they are not allowed to play in the street; and you hear so little of them playing anywhere, that you would be quite inclined, did you not meet some under the care of nurses in walks and gardens, to believe there were none; or, as has actually been the case here once, only one child born in the year! A profound silence hovers over the whole place; and it is amazing that so many active persons should go forth to all parts of the world from a centre which seems the very centre of the realms of sleep. They call it themselves Life in Stillness. The whole manner and bearing of the people are those of such as have nothing to do with the passions and agitations of this world, but are living entirely in preparation for another. A worthy old officer, Major von Aderkas, whom we found here, said smiling, 'I have had a stormy and troubled existence, and longed for a quiet haven, and thank God I have found it, and enjoy it from my soul; and here I shall end my days with thankfulness. But many come here who at first are struck with the repose of the place, and thinking nothing would be so agreeable as to spend their lives here, they try it, and generally think a month long enough. No; Herrnhut is not the place for those who have not weaned themselves thoroughly from the world, nor have arrived, through troubles and treacheries, at an abiding weariness of it.'

'To the Herrnhuters themselves, their daily labour, their religious and social meetings, their prayer and singing hours, and the discharge of their duties to the communities, are enjoyments sufficient. Every now and then they have, too, meetings for the reading of the news from their different missionary stations all over the world; and these

must be times of great excitement. We went through the brethren and the sister house, and were much pleased with the quiet and neatness of everything. Three or four persons form a little company, have one sitting-room where they can also work, and each company has its overseer for the maintenance of order. The men, most of them, work out in the village; the women in the house, sewing, knitting, and doing other women's work; and there is a room where all the articles made are exposed for sale. The sisters' house is large and very clean, and has a nice garden. We saw many young girls at various employments, and were told that it required diligent labour for one of them to earn three Prussian dollars, about nine shillings, weekly. It was interesting to see in both houses persons who had been into distant and very different parts of the world, into the hottest and the coldest regions, in the missionary cause; and the children of missionaries who had been born amongst the Caffres or the Esquimaux. Each community had its common dining-room, where they all dined, but at three different tables, each at a different rate of charge, so as to accommodate all persons. Poverty amongst them is no disgrace, except as the result of indolence or imprudence. Each community had also its prayer-room and assembling-room. Music is much cultivated amongst them ; and we observed in every room appropriated to public or private worship an organ or piano, and in every sitting-room that we entered was a violin, a guitar, or flute. It was amusing to see the sleeping-room of the women, which, like the dining-room, was for general use, and stocked with a whole host of little German beds, each for one person. The women in their little white muslin caps had a certain resemblance to Friends, but were distinguished into married and unmarried by the ribbons which tied their caps being of different colours. The young girls had deep red ; the unmarried women, pink ; the married women, blue; and the widows, white or grey. In the brethren's house is a very excellent collection of stuffed birds and other objects of natural history, which missionaries from different countries have enriched. Their church very much resembles a Friends' meeting : there are no pews, but plain benches, the men and women, like the Friends, sitting apart. They had a chair and desk for the preacher, and an organ distinguished the place from a meeting-house of Friends. Indeed, very different to the Friends, they have an intense love of music, and preach, pray, and sing, at stated times and hours. We were admitted to one of their private singing meetings, and were surprised to see the person who presided give out the hymn sitting, and the whole company sing it in the same position. They have too their love-feasts, in imitation of the Agape of the early Christians, at which tea and buns are handed round. All who entertain any enmity against each other are earnestly warned to absent themselves from these meetings till they have rooted the offence from their hearts. At the close of the holy communion each brother renews his pledge of faithfulness to the Lord, and gives his hand upon it to his fellow; the brethren kiss one another, and the sisters also do the same amongst themselves. They have, too, their times of watching,

as at New Year's eve, in accordance with their name, Herrnhüter, or the Lord's Watchers.

'They may contract marriages by mutual agreement, under the approbation of the elders, but they also frequently resort to the lot to determine them, and nothing is more common than for a missionary to send home, requesting them to choose him a wife, who is thus selected. The damsel on whom the lot falls has the liberty to decline the match if she please; but as it is regarded as a clear indication of the will of Providence, it is generally cheerfully acquiesced in, and a young woman will at once prepare herself, on being chosen, to go north or south—to the snowy fields of Labrador, or the burning deserts of Africa. The Herrnhuters declare that scarcely an instance has been known in which these marriages have not been completely happy ones.'—pp. 419—422.

In closing Mr. Howitt's volume, we cheerfully record our conviction of the value and interest of its contents, and strongly recommend its early perusal. It is both instructive and entertaining, and will be found to familiarize the English reader with forms of character and modes of social life vastly different from anything witnessed at home.

Art. VIII. *Letter to Lord Lyndhurst upon the subject of the Appellative Jurisdiction of the House of Lords, the Arrears of Business in the Common Law Courts, the Local Courts' Bill, and the Registry Courts, and Trials of Controverted Elections.* By Thomas Dax, Esq., one of the Masters of the Court of Exchequer. Stevens and Norton.

It is a fact, that a great outcry against the law exists at present in our country—that it is generally considered to be an engine of mischief, and that an almost universal prejudice exists against its expounders. Now, though this may not suffice to prove that the law is bad, it is sufficient to raise a suspicion to that effect, and to induce the reflective mind to inquire whether such an impression be well or ill-founded. This inquiry has been successfully prosecuted by several eminent men within the last fifty years, amongst whom we may reckon Jeremy Bentham, who, with his sturdy, yet honest and dialectical pen, tore the veil which custom and self-interest had, during a course of ages, woven around the legal fabric; and Lord Brougham, who afterwards exposed to general view its many deformities in the light of an impassioned oratory. Their researches in the field of legal science prove demonstratively, that the outcry named is not without a legitimate cause. Moreover, as it would be idle, and perhaps mischievous, to expose the insufficiency of the existing legal system, without, at

the same time, pointing out a better,—as the physician does nothing but mischief by explaining to his patient the aggravated nature of his disease, unless he can also hold forth hopes of recovery;—so they, with others, have proposed their plans for remedying the evils of the present system. Those plans are various, but all of them are, more or less, founded on the principle, that the law has strayed too far into the delusive fields of technical science, and that to render it as useful as the nature of human institutions will admit, it must be restored to the natural path, out of which it has undutifully wandered. Amongst others, Master Dax has proposed his specific, which is, no doubt, appropriate and valuable, so far as it goes, though we think it stops far short of that radical application which so inveterate a disease demands. It is merely a palliative to a malady which rages at the heart. In these cases the seat of the evil must be cleansed, in order to prepare the way for the salutary and life-giving operations of nature. In like manner the law must be reformed, by being simplified and naturalized, before it can be restored to that state of health and useful vigour by which it may accomplish its legitimate ends. The various plans proposed for its amelioration extend chiefly to its administrative parts, and not to that which defines rights and injuries, and prescribes compensation and punishment, probably because the demerits of the administrative portion of the law are more obvious, and, practically, more mischievous than those of the other portion, and the remedy for its defects is plainer and more simple.

It is true, that every age has its peculiar features—that circumstances may render a certain species of administration just and useful at one time, which, at another, would be criminal and baneful. What in the age of William the Conqueror might have been a legal or a political axiom, in the reign of Victoria may be the reverse. This principle, deduced from the history of human affairs, furnishes an unanswerable argument against the existing state of the legal administration of this country. But we go further, and deny the policy of this administration, even when its principles were first conceived and settled, and when it was first brought into operation. What is the end of the civil laws? it might be asked. To prescribe a certain course of conduct to be followed by the subjects of the state. In case those laws should be violated, and there should consequently be a departure from that course, what means are to be adopted to repair the breach? We reply: those means which would lead to the discovery of the offender, and of the amount of the offence; which would procure to the offended party due compensation for the wrong committed, and would inflict proper

punishment on the offender to induce his reformation, and which would do all this expeditiously and economically. In every free and enlightened community, it has been usual, when a subject has violated its laws, to summon such subject, at the instance of the party who has suffered injury, before the constituted tribunal at a certain time, where the injured party propounds his charge against the wrong doer, and the latter makes his answer, either by admitting the truth of the charge and submitting to punishment, or by denying the truth of the charge and proving his innocence, or by admitting the truth of the charge, but justifying his conduct on some ground declared sufficient by the law. After the tribunal has decided on the merits of the case, then will follow, if necessary, the execution of its decision by compulsory process. This method is natural, easy, and just, and would be subservient to all the ends of justice if conducted on proper principles. Having defined the ends which should be sought to be accomplished by legal proceedings, and stated the radical means by which those ends may be obtained, we shall proceed to show the imperfections of English law proceedings.

First,—The documents used are deficient in information and definitiveness.

It is just that the suspected offender should be sufficiently informed of the default or the offence imputed to him, before he is called upon to answer the charge. We deny that English legal process affords this information, for who but a member of the legal profession can compress within the compass of his understanding the facts intended to be disclosed by, and the real design of the document or proceeding which are so enveloped in mysterious and inexplicable concatenations, are conveyed in terms whose meanings are only to be found in the musty glossaries of antiquity, and are stated in a manner so calculated to mislead and confound the party charged, for whose information and guidance the document was professedly intended. What a contrast would be presented to the uncorrupted eye between the same subject matters of complaint stated in the mystic phraseology of a legal document, and when worded in a natural and intelligible style, and in exact accordance with the facts of the case. Even to the professional adviser himself, the specific facts are most frequently unknown, unless he obtain a knowledge of them extrinsically. To show the inconsistency of the forms in which the law requires complaints to be stated, we need only mention, that the selfsame form is used to represent cases that are as widely different in nature and substance as the complication and diversity of human affairs can produce. The professed design of the document viewed in this light being, as before stated, to acquaint the party charged, of the grounds of the com-

plaint, how terms he does not understand, how statements that have no bearing on the subject matter of complaint, can answer this purpose, would be a problem insolvable by the most ingenious special pleader. If light be preferable to darkness, or certainty to uncertainty, then why in the name of common reason does the British parliament allow the incongruous elements, of which the executive portion of our law is composed, to remain unreformed?

Secondly, — These documents want conciseness and individuality in their statement of facts.

If a certain object can be obtained by an easy and straightforward course, would it not be the rankest folly to pursue another, which is perplexing and circuitous? In the document designed to state the complaint, nothing more is reasonably required than an accurate description of the alleged offence, and of the material circumstances out of which it arose. Applying this test to those documents called *Declarations* in civil cases, and *Indictments* in criminal cases, are they not found wanting? Do they not deal in vain repetition and unmeaning tautology? Is not the same fact stated over and over again, though not always in the same words? So ridiculously was this rule acted on in one instance, where the prisoner was accused of stealing a box of eightpence value, that when the indictment was read in court, a juror of the prisoner's acquaintance was struck with infinite surprise at the vastness of the imputed theft, and said, that the prisoner must have plundered a whole neighbourhood of its boxes. But the lawyer may say that the use of these different statements of the same offence, or, in legal phrase, different *counts*, is to prove the offence on one of the charges or counts, in case the other or others should fail, so that the offender might not escape from punishment for want of a charge which in legal optics would be deemed sufficiently perfect. But civil laws were intended to be subservient to the ends of justice, and not the latter to crouch to the fanciful formalities of the former. If the offence be proved according to the substance of the charge, let not the guilty escape from punishment, though the rules of legal technicality may not have been minutely acted upon in setting forth the charge. If a person be convicted of a breach of those laws which the united wisdom of the representative body has enacted for the welfare of the state, let him not escape from retributive punishment, though another form of charge would better suit the taste of the judge. But we shall be accused of an unfriendly design against the law as an intellectual science, and we do not deny that we would convert it from an ideal into a real science—a science that will serve to discover on which side lies the balance of justice amongst the multiplicity of disputes that daily arise in the affairs of civil life.

We duly appreciate the worth of established and known rules of general application, and deem them the greatest security against individual caprice, and as the great landmarks by which to steer our conduct. All we advocate is, that those rules should be founded on such principles as will best answer the ends of distributive justice with the least inconvenience and pecuniary loss to the already injured suitor.

Thirdly, — The technicality of the documents used is excessive.

It may be safely laid down, that our courts of justice devote one third part of their time to hear and to adjudicate upon discrepancies of a formal and trifling character. Even the not entailing a title of dignity is a sufficient ground to defeat a just prosecution of a wrongdoer. Now, if an amendment of so fantastical an error were permitted, what right would thereby be violated; or, without such an amendment, if the individual be otherwise sufficiently described and distinguished, what injustice would follow if such description were held sufficient? This is not a solitary instance; the books teem with multitudes of the same nature. The prevention of wrong has been universally considered to be the great end of civil jurisprudence. Will a system of law accomplish this end more effectually, by offering to the wrongdoer a hundred chances of escape from punishment, (not because he is found to be innocent, but because an unimportant informality occurs in the statement of the charge against him,) than by presenting to his mind the certainty of a proportionate punishment, if his guilt be proved? Is it not ridiculous that that science which has cognizance of our all in this life, that has for its determination the various differences which arise between man and man, and on whose decision hang the life, liberty, and property of the subject: that that science should diverge from the pursuit of its real and vital objects—the discovery and punishment of the offender—to entertain quibbles which itself has created, and thereby to retard, and frequently to prevent the course of justice?

Moreover, under the present technical system, known and glaring falsehood is stated, and is not only tolerated by the law, but is even enforced. It is a rule, that every material fact which is stated in the document of pleading must be laid to have been done on a specified day, and at a specified time, naming the day, month, year, parish, and county. Now it generally happens that these data of time and place are not known to any one, still the law inflexibly demands a statement of them. In this dilemma, what is to be done? The law which created the difficulty, prescribes the way of escape, by telling the party to state the fact to have been done at any time or place his fancy can select, how

untrue soever; and it,—viz., the law, will indemnify him against all evil consequences of the falsehood. This instance is but one out of many in which mendacity is not only tolerated, but is even enforced by the present technical system of English law. Then, the question immediately suggests itself, is it necessary for the ends of justice, that under a system of legal procedure, falsehood should enter into the composition of the documents whose professed purpose is to disclose the truth? Is it the best way to gain the temple of truth by travelling along the gloomy and the desert path that leads to the cave of falsehood? Let any disciple of the wisdom of our ancestors answer these questions in the affirmative before we shall attempt to establish the negative.

Fourthly,—The proceedings are too numerous and complex.

What may be the use of those long, tedious, and intricate proceedings which keep the suit hanging like an evil spirit for months over the heads of the parties before it can be brought to a trial, except to fill the pockets of lawyers, it is hard to say. That they accomplish the latter object is now-a-days an axiom. That they prey, vulture-like, upon the minds and the pockets of the litigating parties, is also an axiom; but the supposed sacredness of the legal edifice keeps them patient and murmurless under the ordeal. What is the pretended use of these voluminous proceedings? Why, to disclose the really disputed facts of the case: as if truth, like gold, requires to undergo a long purifying process before it is fit to be touched by judicial hands. Truly, a mountain in labour producing a mouse. An intelligent magistrate would, in an hour, arrive at a knowledge of the material points in difference between the litigants, better than any system of written special pleading could disclose, by simply examining the parties and their witnesses, while the present mode takes sometimes weeks, and sometimes months, to develop the facts in dispute; and crude and mysterious enough, it must be confessed, do they appear when at last brought forth. During this long process, it may be, that many a grave and learned argument is held, before sage and reverend functionaries, to overthrow a document, because it approaches a little nearer to common sense than the wisdom of the law declares desirable. The document is nullified, and then the unfortunate party must use the strait-waistcoat of special pleading before he can be again admitted into court. It may, perhaps, with truth be said, that the law of England is infected with the plague that adhered to the schoolmen, who, not content with the safe and salutary philosophy of fact, were entangled in the nets they had woven, and deceived by the chimeras they themselves had cherished.

Fifthly,—The division of the judicial tribunals into courts of law and of equity is improper.

That there is any essential difference between law proper and equity is an error. That law can have its separate province where it may accomplish its legitimate ends, without the presence of equity, and that equity can have its independent sphere without the intervention of law, is a palpable absurdity. To separate equity from law would be the same in principle as to separate the soul from the body, or to sever the branch from the tree. In a word, law proper and equity are parts of the same general machine, the separation of the one from the other being impossible. But English lawyers attempt to separate these two fraternal beings, and to assign to them their distinct habitations, where they may live and move, but, under severe pains and penalties, they are interdicted from paying a visit to each other, or from entering upon each other's territories. Thus, English law, which in more instances than one affects omnipotence, professes to divide that which in its nature is indivisible. But then, like the system of the fatalist, if tested by facts, it will be found to be disowned alike by experience and by the lawyer. For, let any legal functionary be asked if the courts of law administer justice, thinking the affirmative answer to that question to be self-evident, and highly indignant at your ignorance or scepticism, he would, perhaps, punish you by his action of slander, or by commitment to prison for a contempt of court. Let him be further asked if they administer equity, and he will immediately and by intuition, answer,—No. Let him then be requested to explain the difference between justice and equity, and he will give you a long legal disquisition, with quotations from the opinions of sages, ancient and modern, the effect of which will be, to adopt a simple comparison, that law, alias justice, is a tiger that seizes unmercifully on its prey, but that equity is a lion that has clemency when striking its victim. But, let the lawyer be held down to reasoning from common facts, and he will be forced to confess that the attempted distinction between law and equity is legal, and not real, and that the courts of law and the courts of equity administer the same political medicine,—viz., justice or equity. Then why, in this age of light and of reason, is a delusion so glaring supported in the constitution of those tribunals, which, according to their profession, should be nought but consummate purity and truth?

Sixthly—The intervals between the sittings of the different courts for the disposal of business are too long.

Under the present system; a simple cause at law involving, perhaps, only the sum of 5*l.* as the amount of the damages which are ultimately recovered, cannot, upon an average, have an opportunity of being tried in a less period than six months; and, frequently, the technical system, and the long vacations together, protract the trial

much longer. Now, what are the advantages of these long intervals, during which the hands of civil justice are paralysed? To the suitors, none; to the lawyers, a rich harvest of profit, of which they in general make the best use. What are their disadvantages? To the suitors, delay, expense, and vexation, which like birds of prey, continually hover around and torment their victims. Then, is this evil in the legal system necessary, or may it be removed? We conceive that it may be easily remedied, and *that*, in the first place, by a better division and a more industrious application of the time of the present judges, and by adding to their number.

Seventhly,—The right of appeal which exists from one court to another is improper.

At present, a cause, which has been tried and decided upon its merits, when the judge and the jury heard the evidence given on both sides, and formed their decision from a due regard to those subjects which are its proper elements, may be afterwards retried and redecided by a tribunal which looks only to the written record of the proceedings at the former trial. In this manner, a cause which has been tried by a judge in the Queen's Bench and a jury of upright citizens, may be carried into the Exchequer Chamber, to be retried by a jury of judges; and thence again into the House of Lords. Frequently, these tribunals, looking at the case through the medium of special pleading and of technical law, form a decision in direct violation of that course which justice pointed out. And, be it remembered, these appeals are very expensive and very dilatory. Thus, a rich litigant, though worsted at the first trial, may drag his poor opponent through these costly places, until, at length, the resources of the latter being exhausted, he gives up the contest wearied and worn out. This is not an ideal picture, but is too frequently seen in the course of human life. Besides, the present system contains an assumption, that the judge who sits in the court of appeal is wiser and more competent to discharge his duties, than the one who sat in the first court. If it be so, why not let him sit and try the cause in the first instance, and thus save all the chances of misdecision which the other method involves? By means of these appeals, the final decision of a suit may be protracted for a year, or for two or more years; the consequences of which are, to all classes of suitors, delay, expense, and corroding vexation, and frequently, to poor suitors, temporal ruin, and denial of justice. What is the remedy for this evil in the legal system? Why, merely to demolish the useless and injurious superstructure which incumbers the building, and affords protection and relief to those who seek an asylum within its walls.

Lastly,—As a corollary or conclusion deducible from the foregoing premises, it follows that the administrative part of the present law of England is productive to the suitors of delay, excessive expense, vexation of mind, and frequent injustice.

Having pointed out the evils of the present system of administrative law, we shall next briefly delineate a plan which would be free from those evils, and would, at the same time, fulfil the ends of distributive justice in the civil state, so far as the same depend on the agency of a system of means.

We would propose that England and Wales should be divided into as many districts as should be thought proper, in proportion to the population. That a judge should be appointed to act as such for each of such districts. That the judge should hold courts for the disposal of business in his district, or in the various towns or parts of his district, as often as the necessities of the inhabitants should require. If his district included only a large town or part of a large town, then, that he should hold public courts daily (with of course reasonable exceptions); if it include a county, or two or more counties, then, that he should make a periodical circuit, say once a month, through the various important, central towns of his district, and should there hold public courts; allotting his time to the disposal of business at the various places where courts are holden according to the wants of the inhabitants. Let the judicial tribunal at these courts consist of the judge and of a jury of citizens, as at present. Let each court have its proper officers and attorneys to conduct its proceedings. Then, let the person who conceives himself to have been injured by another, and who desires the assistance of the civil law to procure for him redress, by himself or his attorney, make out a plain, business-like statement of the default or offence, with a statement of the amount of the compensation claimed, (if the wrong received be of a nature for which compensation is properly claimable,) and, lastly, with a notice at the bottom summoning the wrongdoer to appear at the next or other sitting of the district court (at which the attendance of the parties would be reasonably practicable), which will be holden at a certain time and place, specifying them, to answer the complaint stated. Then, let a copy of this bill of particulars and notice be delivered to the wrongdoer (whom we will call the defendant), at a time, the interval between which and the sitting of the court, therein specified, would be sufficient to enable the defendant to make all due preparations for his defence. At the sitting of the court specified, let the complainant, his advocate, and witnesses attend, when and where, if the defendant do not appear to answer the charge in person or by attorney, after proof of delivery to him of the particulars and notice, let the complainant enter into the

proof of his complaint, and if thought sufficiently proved by the judicial tribunal, let them award a proper sum, as compensation for the wrong received, to be paid by the defendant, or such other redress as the nature of the case may require. If the defendant do appear at the specified sitting by himself or his attorney, and there deny the charge, or admit the charge, but justify his conduct by the allegation of some ground of exculpation which is by law declared sufficient, then let the case be tried upon proper evidence, and the judicial tribunal deliver their verdict, declaring the guilt or the innocence of the defendant, and direct certain consequential acts to be done fulfilling the ends of redress and punishment, or of exculpation, according to the nature of the verdict. And lastly, let the court be armed with proper power to enforce the execution of its decision in cases where that becomes necessary.

The foregoing is but the outline of a plan of procedure, the details of which, though a statement of them would be out of place and tedious in this article, might easily be settled on systematic principles. It will have been observed that the plan is directly applicable only to that class of legal causes, arising from private or individual wrongs, called civil, and not to that class arising from public wrongs, called criminal; though its radical principles may be advantageously applied to the proceedings which are adopted in reference to the latter.

That the principles advocated in the foregoing remarks have been gradually gaining ground, even amongst lawyers, is proved by the fact that the greatest part of the important law reforms which have taken place within the last twenty years, has, to a limited extent, been founded upon them. Great praise is due to the late chancellor, Lord Cottenham, for his efforts in the field of legal reform. The same praise is also merited by Lord Lyndhurst, for introducing into the upper house of parliament, a bill for the establishment of local courts, to which jurisdiction was proposed to be given over causes arising from debt not exceeding 20*l.*, the machinery of which bill was nearly identical with that of the foregoing outline. It is hoped, that these learned lords will not relinquish their laudable undertaking; but that, with others of their noble and learned compeers, as well as intelligent members of the House of Commons, they will propose and effectuate such salutary and organic reforms in the law, as will wipe away those deformities, which, unquestionably, render it repugnant to the interests, genius, and designs of the age in which we live.

Brief Notices.

The Vicar of Wakefield. By Oliver Goldsmith. *With Thirty-two Illustrations.* By William Mulready, R.A. London: Van Voorst. 1843.

We have been much gratified by observing the tendency recently evinced by our artists to seek alliance with the more valuable and permanent productions of our literature. This is a much more desirable state of things than that which has been fashionable for some years past, and will not fail to exercise a healthy influence over the public mind. The lavish expenditure of artistical skill on the class of annuals, has been for the most part in the inverse proportion to their literary merits. When the eye has turned from the engraver to the poet, from the illustration of the pencil to that of the pen, it has been difficult, in many cases, to avoid a feeling of bitter disappointment. There has been such a want of harmony, such a perceptible contrast between affluence and poverty, splendour of conception and feebleness of intellect, that one has wished the artist had spurned the association in which he is made to appear, and presented himself to us without companion or co-worker. The case is very different, however, with a class of works now happily appearing. A short time since we had before us an edition of '*Thomson's Seasons*,' illustrated by members of the Etching Club, of which we spoke in terms of high and well merited eulogy. The volume now on our table is illustrated after a different order, but will prove an equal favourite with the discerning few. The selection of '*The Vicar of Wakefield*' has been judicious, for few works are more popular, or more adapted to the style of illustration here attempted. The object aimed at has been 'that character and composition may, with the aid of drawing, appeal directly to the understanding;' and it is only to look at the engravings themselves to perceive in how happy a degree this has been accomplished. Several of them are complete tales in themselves. The mind of the artist communes directly with that of the intelligent reader, conveying impressions of character and events as by instinct, and with much more vividness than any letter-press could do. Every lover of Goldsmith will seek to possess himself of so beautiful a volume, which admits of no comparison with any of its predecessors.

Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology. Edited by Wm. Smith, Ph. D., Editor of the 'Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities.' Part I. 8vo, pp. 128. London: Taylor and Walton. 1843.

We owe an apology to the learned editor of this work, for having so long delayed to notice his very valuable 'Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities;' of which we hope shortly to present some account

to our readers. We may mention, however, that the long delay has been occasioned by circumstances over which the editor of this journal had no control. He had been promised a notice of the work by a scholar in every way competent to form a judgment of its merits, but whose untimely and lamented death has unhappily frustrated this as well as many other more important projects.

Of the 'Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology,' we can only say at present that it promises, in no respect, to discredit its predecessor,—of which the public have already testified their approbation, in the way most pleasing to publishers and writers—by *purchasing* it. Assuredly the present work is not less *needed* than the 'Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities;' perhaps we might say, that it is needed much more. That Lempriere should have enjoyed so extensive a sale, and so prolonged a popularity, notwithstanding his superficiality and inaccuracies, can be accounted for only on the principle of the old proverb, that 'half a loaf is better than no bread.' Considering the zeal with which classical literature has been of late years cultivated, both in this country and on the Continent, that so many of the valuable and deeply learned works of Germany have been familiar at least to our principal scholars, that all the sources of ancient history have been so sagaciously and accurately investigated, it is really disgraceful to literature that such an ill-digested compilation as that of Lempriere should have been so long left in the hands of the school-boy and the student. This evil, we confidently expect, will now be remedied.

The present work, as a single sentence from the prospectus will show, is to take a very wide range. 'The Biographical articles will include the names of all persons of any importance which occur in the Greek and Roman writers, from the earliest times down to the extinction of the Western Empire in the year 476 of our era, and to the extinction of the Eastern Empire by the capture of Constantinople by the Turks in the year 1453.' The sources of information also will embrace the most elaborate and valuable works of continental scholarship. 'The writings of modern German philologists, as Niebuhr, Savigny, Böckh, K.O. Müller, Wachsmuth, Droysen, Drumann, Brandis, Ritter, Welcker, Bode, Westerman, Lobeck, and others, as well as the works of some of our own scholars, Thirlwall, Arnold, and Clinton, have cleared up many of the difficulties connected with these subjects, and enabled us to attain to more correct knowledge and more comprehensive views than were formerly possessed. The articles in this dictionary will be founded on a careful examination of the original sources, with such aid as may be derived from the best modern authorities. We must not forget another and very valuable feature of the work. 'Such of the articles as are susceptible of it will be illustrated by wood-cuts from ancient coins.'

We very cordially wish the learned editor all success in his undertaking, and warmly recommend the work to the attention of our readers.

Is it good, or is it Evil? A short tract on Slavery. Printed for the Ladies' Anti-Slavery Society, Bond-street, Birmingham. London: Ward.

A brief, but excellent publication, well suited to its object, and worthy of extensive circulation. We heartily recommend it to our young people, as fitted to increase their abhorrence of slavery, and to render them more anxious for its speedy and universal extinction.

Anti-Popery; or Popery Unreasonable, Unscriptural, and Novel. By John Rogers. Third edition, revised and improved. London: Simpkin.

A greatly improved edition of a work which deserves to live. In point of matter it is somewhat larger than its predecessors, particularly under the head of 'Priestal Absolution,' is purged from those peculiarities of phraseology which gave them a somewhat repulsive appearance, and is vended at a third of the price at which the first edition sold. We trust it will obtain the wide circulation it merits.

No Popery. The Cry Examined. 8vo. pp. 15. Third Edition. London: John Snow.

An admirable pamphlet, of the reasoning and spirit of which it is difficult to speak too highly. Clear in argumentation, correct in principle, fervent in appeal, and thoroughly courteous and gentlemanly in its whole tone, it has our entire approval and warmest good wishes. The seeds of important truths are scattered with a liberal hand throughout its pages.

The Works of William Jay, collected and revised by himself. Vol. V. London: C. A. Bartlett.

The '*Life of Cornelius Winter*' has been out of print for some years, and we are not therefore surprised to find, that prior to his contemplating the present uniform edition of his works, Mr. Jay had been led 'to think of sending it to the press again.' It is one of the best books in our language, good for all classes, but specially useful to the rising ministry. In common, therefore, with many others, we have regretted its not being before the public in an accessible form, and we hail the present reprint as an invaluable accession to our stock of religious biography. Every young minister should possess the book, and some of older years would not be injured by its attentive perusal. The present volume has two title-pages, and may therefore be purchased separately, or as one of a uniform series. 'In this edition,' the venerated author informs us, 'there have been no alterations, but the additions are very considerable. They consist not only of various notes by the editor, but a number more of Mr. Winter's

letters. These consist of letters to a poor and pious rustic, to John Thornton, Esq., the renowned philanthropist, to several of his students, to some of his friends, dated from Georgia, whither he went with Mr. Whitefield, and where he was engaged to teach the slave population, followed by a few addresses to occasional correspondents, and which are interspersed with the letters of the old edition, but marked with an asterisk.

Diary and Letters of Madame D'Arblay. Edited by her Niece. Vol. V. London: Colburn.

Having reviewed, at considerable length, the prior volumes of this work, we must restrict ourselves at present to a mere annunciation of the one before us. On the appearance of the sixth volume, we shall notice its contents more at large, and in the meantime simply remark that it is the most interesting of the series, embracing the period from 1789 to 1793 inclusive.

Polynesia; or, An Historical Account of the Principal Islands in the South Sea, including New Zealand; the Introduction of Christianity; and the actual Condition of the Inhabitants in regard to Civilization, Commerce, and the Arts of Social Life. By the Right Rev. M. Russell, LL.D. and D.C.L. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd.

This is an interesting and valuable volume, the main object of which is to throw light on the introduction of Christianity and civilization into the islands of the South Sea. It displays considerable research, an enlightened estimate of missionary labour, and a happy exemption from the prejudices too common with the class to which the author belongs. 'Some pains have been taken to exhibit the actual condition of society in Polynesia; the manners which have been adopted by the natives from their European visitors; the improvement of taste and sentiment among the higher class; a desire for the conveniences, and even the luxuries, of civilized life; and, above all, the disappearance of those gross indulgences which so often called forth the reprobation of the religious teacher. A view is also given of the manufacturing industry and commercial relations which have been established in some of the Islands, more especially in those of the Sandwich group, where consuls from England, and from the United States, have for some time past resided, under the protection of the local government.' We thank Dr. Russell both for the diligence and temper with which he has executed his undertaking, and strongly recommend his volume to the perusal of our friends. It is every way worthy of its place in the *Edinburgh Cabinet Library*, of which it forms the thirty-third volume.

The Servant of the Age. A Discourse occasioned by the death of the Rev. Nun Morgan Harry, Minister of New Broad Street Meeting-House. By Caleb Morris. London: Ward and Co.

The circumstances connected with this discourse are so peculiar, as to induce us to depart from our rule, of not noticing single sermons. Mr. Harry was for many years a highly-respected minister in the metropolis, and was increasing in popularity and usefulness, when he was cut off, after a short illness, in the prime of life. He has left a widow and five children, almost entirely dependent for their support on the generous kindness of Christian friends. The profits of this sermon are to be devoted to their use. We should therefore, on this ground, if on no other, earnestly hope that its sale might be extensive.

But this is by no means the only ground of our hope. Mr. Caleb Morris's large circle of friends and admirers will not be disappointed by this discourse. It abounds with just, solemn, and striking thoughts, expressed in a style correct, chaste, and often beautiful, There is nothing common-place about it, its subject, sentiments, or forms; but while it is thoroughly scriptural, it possesses a freshness and originality, not a little delightful to the many who are tired of the common run of pulpit ministrations, and especially of funeral sermons. Mr. Morris talks about life, not death; the service of this world, not the rewards of another; and the tendency of his discourse is to brace and gird for healthful and holy action, and not to excite soft and sentimental meditations on the grave and heaven. The text is Acts, xiii. 36, 'David, after he had served his own generation, by the will of God, fell on sleep.' Two questions are proposed and answered: the first at length; the second briefly, from the necessity of space—*How* and *Why* we should serve our age? The reply to the former is—We must be first of all *the servants of God*—we must *study the age*—we must *spread our affections over the length and breadth of the age*—and we must *ascertain the particular department of service to the age which is assigned to us.* The answer to the latter embraces the following thoughts:—Because *God wills it*—because *the age has served us*—because *this is the only age we can serve*—and because *the age and ourselves are speedily to give an account to the God of all ages.* Then follow an interesting sketch of Mr. Harry's life, and a just and discriminating account of his mind and ministry. We can most honestly and heartily commend the whole to the perusal of our readers, and only add, that he who can write thus, is bound to 'serve his age' by writing more.

The Great Propitiation; or, Christ's Satisfaction, and Man's Justification by it upon his Faith; that is, Belief of, and Obedience to, the Gospel. By Joseph Truman, B.D. Reprinted from the Second Edition, 1672. Ward's Library of Standard Divinity.

This is a valuable work, and one in the cheap publication of which all lovers of sound theology may well rejoice. It is unnecessary to say that we should not like to commit ourselves to the approval of every

sentiment in a treatise, published nearly two centuries since, on one of the most difficult and comprehensive as well as most important truths of revelation. We are taught by the tendency of Christianity to self-development, not to be surprised at finding in Expositions of an early date some interpretations which are now obsolete. At the same time, we have been greatly pleased by the healthy theological sentiments of the work before us. The great mass of its statements would not dishonour a divine of the present day; while, with sundry quaintnesses of style and familiarities of illustration, to be found plentifully in our older writers, it has their usual excellence, of containing much matter in a little space. Many a modern work on the atonement would contrast but poorly with this work of the seventeenth century. It is very cheap, as well as good, and we hope it will be read extensively.

Sermons of the late Rev. E. Temple, of Rochford, Essex, with a Biographical Sketch of the Author. By his Widow. London: Snow. 1842.

These are the last gifts to the world of a good and useful man who is already known to many as the author of several small volumes for religious devotion. The sermons have been selected from the ordinary discourses of their author by some of his surviving brethren in the ministry, and are introduced by a preface from the pen of the Rev. George Clayton. Without being remarkable for extensive learning, or any peculiar originality of thought or expression, they are appropriate and pleasing statements of the great truths of the gospel. The spiritual benefit of his hearers appears to have been the aim of the preacher in their composition and delivery, and amongst our villages, families, and private circles, they may, with propriety, be added to the short discourses of Jay, Burder, and Beddome.

The approaching Downfall of Popery and Civil Despotism in Europe, &c. By a Layman. London: Ward. Bristol: Philp and Evans. 1842.

Without pledging ourselves to the correctness of all the opinions advocated in this little volume, we commend it to the perusal of our readers. It is a temperate and well written treatise, designed, by exposition of the prophecies of Scripture, to direct attention to the signs of the times. The author supposes that spiritual and civil tyranny among the nations of Europe is to last till the year 1866, when by some sudden revolution it is to be overthrown. This period he fixes on as the end of the 1260 days of prophecy. There is displayed a considerable amount of historical and biblical research, and readers cannot fail to be deeply interested.

Progressive Questioning Book, comprising Steps I., II., and III.; or, Questions on St. Mark, St. Matthew, St. Luke, and the Acts of the Apostles, intended for the use of Teachers in Sunday and other Schools. By the Rev. E. T. M. Phillips, M.A., Rector of Hathern, Leicestershire, &c. London: Seeley and Burnside. 1842.

Sunday-school teachers ought not to need the use of a questioning book so simple and full as this is; but from knowledge of the present state of Sunday-school teaching we are convinced that there are many schools in which it might be employed with advantage as a guide and model to teachers, of questions which they themselves ought to furnish to awaken and inform the minds of their pupils. The fourth and fifth steps will complete the series, and comprise questions on all the books of the New Testament.

Leaves from Eusebius, selected from his celebrated Work, 'The Evangelical Preparation,' and translated from the Original Greek. By the Rev. Henry Street, M.A. London: Edward Bull. 1842.

Amongst the works in defence of Christianity, published by those familiarly known as the Fathers, the 'Evangelical Preparation of Eusebius,' in the estimation of Mr. Street and of others, deservedly holds a high position. In the selection of passages for translation from any writers, and especially from the Christian Fathers, there is great scope for partiality, and without dishonesty of purpose the person who selects may even unconsciously be influenced by preconceived opinions. Mr. Street, in his preface, avows himself a churchman, a docile son, and pupil of the English establishment, tenderly deprecating an appeal to antiquity, which shall "disturb her decisions, contradict their spirit and intention, and prepare the way for endless innovations of faith and practice." Concerning, we suppose, some of us Protestant Dissenters, he more vigorously protests against "a spirit of self-sufficiency which fortifies itself by partial views of Scripture, and in the pride of ignorance treats antiquity with disdain." After these candid utterances of opinion in the preface, we observe on the whole a wise impartiality in selection and translation, and having no wish to 'treat antiquity with disdain,' we hope these leaves may be scattered to the satisfaction of the gatherer. Of the merits of the translation we are unable to speak definitely, not having an immediate access to the original, the folio of R. Stephens, reprinted at Paris, A.D. 1628, but we fancied in reading that there was occasionally a freedom and popularity of translation which might interfere with a faithful transcript of the original. In any future edition, it would be well also to distinguish more accurately, perhaps by a change of type, the selections from Eusebius, his quotation from other writers, and matter thrown in to connect the argument. On the subject of the genuineness of the work of Porphyry, 'Of the Philosophy of Oracles,' which is often quoted by Eusebius in this book, Mr. Street commits himself to neither opinion, though, contrary to Dr. Lardner and others, he would appear to favour the affirmative. To

those interested in the opinions of the early Christians, and the manner of their warfare with declining Paganism, these leaves will afford easy and profitable instruction.

Memorials of the Life, Ministry, and Correspondence of the Rev. Theophilus Lessey, to which is added a Sermon, preached on occasion of his Death. By John Hannah, D.D. London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co.

Memoir and Remains of the Rev. Henry Vaughan, A.B., Vicar of Crickhowel, Brecknockshire; and Minister of Park Chapel, Chelsea. London: Seeley and Burnside.

We especially commend Dr. Hannah's memoir of the above excellent and useful servant of Christ, to the attention of young ministers, and students for the Christian ministry. The growth of religion in the soul is, as Mr. Lessey and his biographers often remark in the course of this volume, the first element in ministerial success, and when associated with natural powers of a high order, matured by reading and study, cannot fail to render its subjects an eminent blessing to society. 'The papers and facts from which these memorials were composed, were collected and supplied by Mrs. Lessey.' The lamented man whose history they exhibit, was beloved and valued by Christians of all denominations. Whilst this book is sure of an extensive circulation amongst Wesleyan Methodists, it deserves to be read beyond the boundaries of that religious body of which Mr. Lessey was so useful a member and distinguished an ornament.

The other memoir at the head of this brief notice is that of an excellent and devoted clergyman of the established church. The biographer appears to imitate the suavity of his subject. The work, we are told, was prepared exclusively for private circulation, and principally consists of copious extracts from the letters of friends of the deceased. It might—very advantageously for public circulation—have been compressed within narrower limits.

Catholic and Evangelical Principles viewed in their present application to the Church of God, in a series of Letters to a Friend. By Alfred Barrett. London: Hamilton and Adams. 1843.

Danger and Duty; or, A Few Words on the present State of the Times, and in behalf of Truth, Righteousness, and Peace. By the Rev. Richard Marks, Vicar of Great Missenden, Bucks. London: Nisbet and Co. 1842.

The Charge of the Bishop of London Examined, and its Unscriptural Tendency set forth. By one of the Laity. London: Nisbet and Co. 1842.

These three publications all refer to the subject which now engrosses the attention of many Christians of all classes—Puseyism. The first is by a stanch Wesleyan methodist, who, with great affection for

episcopacy, from which he ventures to assert every revival of true religion has arisen, strongly remonstrates against the unkind and tyrannical spirit displayed by the church of Oxford. The book might be entitled 'A Plea for Methodism.' By using as synonymous the terms evangelical doctrine and methodism, the author boldly declares Luther was a methodist, and makes many other statements equally extravagant. There are, perhaps, in the Wesleyan system excellences which congregational dissenters would do well to observe and imitate, the introduction of which would in no respect compromise the important principle of congregational independence. To all those interested in understanding the singular position of the Wesleyan body in regard to the ecclesiastical questions of the day, we suggest the perusal of Mr. Barrett's treatise. It is written with ability and learning, and in a mild and Christian temper. As the book treats minutely of many subjects about which there is much diversity of opinion, it will receive partial approval and disapprobation; but we shall be glad if it directs the attention of the numerous body to which the author belongs, to the topics of which it treats. We venture to express our conviction that his favourite methodism, although a hundred years old, has not yet passed the critical period of its existence as a system of ecclesiastical polity, and is not in a position to treat with superciliousness more ancient separations from the establishment. The reception of the seed in stony places, as described in the parable of the Sower, may have an analogy in ecclesiastical systems as well as individual minds, and time only may be necessary to declare its application.

Both the other pamphlets are by members of the church of England. Each is worthy of perusal. That of Mr. Marks is appropriate for distribution among, we fear, the decreasing number of evangelical clergyman still in the establishment, and may serve to awaken their attention and urge them to the performance of their duty, though it be very difficult for them to act with decision and earnestness while encumbered with liturgies, creeds, and rubric, which, according to the admissions of their advocates, give an uncertain and ambiguous sound. The pamphlet by a layman, impugns, with a freedom which priests will find difficult to repress, the conduct of an individual bishop.

Essays in reference to Socinianism, in Two Parts. Part the First. By Joseph Cottle. London: Longman and Co. 1842.

The titles of these essays are, the Simple Manhood of Christ—Christ the Final Judge—On Materialism—On the Pre-existence of Christ—On Eternal Punishments—Satan—Hell—On the Atonement—and on the Divinity of the Holy Spirit. They consist, for the most part, of passages of Scripture relating to these subjects, with observations on each of them. The author rejoices that, having passed the age of man, he has been spared to express these, his matured views of Socinianism. Respect for age leads us to forbear criticism. The book is distinguished by an earnest zeal for truth and righteousness.

Literary Intelligence.

In the Press.

The Memoir of Mrs. George Clayton, late wife of the Rev. George Clayton, Walworth, London. By Joseph Sortain, A.B., of Trinity College, Dublin, Minister of North Street Chapel, Brighton.

Mr. Ryland's translation, from the German, of the Rev. C. Temisch's work on the Life, Writings, and Doctrines of Justin Martyr, is expected to appear in the course of a few months. The author has favoured the translator with several corrections and additions, which will be incorporated with the translation.

In one large volume, 8vo, Memoir of the last Archbishop of Tuam, the Hon. and Most Rev. Power Le Poer Trench, D.D., and his Dioceses. By the Rev. Joseph D'Arcy Sirr, D.D., Rector of Kilcoleman, Diocese of Tuam.

Early in March will appear the Treatise of D. Diodati, 'De Christo Græce loquente.' Edited by the Rev. A. T. Dobbin, LL.B.

Mrs. Cowden Clarke's Shaksperian Concordance.—This work, which has occupied more than thirteen years in preparation and compilation, is now being printed, and the first number is expected to be ready early in March. It includes, not only every word in the various readings of the old editions, but has been completed to the present time by including the variations which occur in the editions of Charles Knight, Tyas, and Paine Collier.

Just Published.

Wesleyan Missions: their Progress Stated and their Claims Enforced. By Robert Alder, D.D.

Introductory Latin Delectus: with a Copious Vocabulary. By George Ferguson, A.M.

Sermons, preached in the ordinary course of his ministry, and chiefly at Manchester. By the late Robert Stephens M'All, LL.D.

Knight's Library Edition of Shakspere. Vol. VII. Histories, Tragedies. Second Edition.

The Biographical Dictionary of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge. Vol. II.

Sequel to Appeals made to the Government and People of Great Britain against the Niger Expedition, before its departure from England; with a Letter addressed to Lord Stanley. By Robert Jamieson, Esq.

Sir Robert Peel and his Era; being a Synoptical View of the Chief Events and Measures of his Life and Times.

Judah's Lion. By Charlotte Elizabeth.

Letters and Biography of Felix Neff, translated from the French of M. Bost. By Margaret Anne Wyatt.

Second Causes; or, 'Up and be Doing!' By Charlotte Elizabeth.

Sabbaths at Home; or, a Help to their Right Improvement. By Henry March. Third Edition.

Strictures on Certain Portions of Dr. Marshall's late Work on the Atonement. By an English Congregational Minister.

Ward's Library of Standard Divinity. The Great Propitiation. By Joseph Truman, B.D.

What is the power of the Greek Article, and how may it be expressed in the English Version of the New Testament? By John Taylor.

Memoirs of the Life of the Rev. John Williams, Missionary to Polynesia. By Ebenezer Prout, of Halstead. Second Thousand.

The Advancement of Religion the Claim of the Times. By Andrew Reed, D.D.

Notes, Explanatory and Practical, on the New Testament. By Albert Barnes. Vol. IV. Epistle to the Romans.

Poetical Remains of Lucretia Davidson; with a Biography. By Miss Sedgwick.

The Life of William Bedell, D.D., Bishop of Kilmore. By H. J. Monck Mason, LL.D., M.R.I.A.

Lectures on Popery. By the Rev. John Owen, Curate of Gaddesby.

Songs from the Parsonage; or, Lyrical Teaching. By a Clergyman.

The Good Samaritan; a Lecture illustrative of Christian Benevolence. By Samuel Hulme.

The History of the Reformation. By J. H. Merle D'Aubigné. Translated by David D. Scott. Illustrated with Portraits. Parts 13—24.

The Slave Trade and Slavery: the Influence of British Settlements on the west coast of Africa, in relation to both, illustrated by extracts from the Letters of Dr. R. R. Madden, in the 'Morning Chronicle,' the 'United Service Gazette,' &c.

Union without Uniformity.—The Addresses delivered at the Meeting for Union at Craven Chapel, 2nd Jan. 1843. Revised by their authors.

The Poetical Works of John Milton; with a Memoir and Critical Remarks on his Genius and Writings, by James Montgomery; and 120 Engravings, from Drawings by Harvey. 2 vols.

A Narrative of a Visit to the Australian Colonies. By James Backhouse. Illustrated by three maps, 15 etchings, &c. 1 vol. 8vo.

A Celestial Atlas, containing maps of all the Constellations visible in Great Britain, with corresponding blank maps of the Stars. By J. Middleton.

Companion to Middleton's Celestial Atlas, containing a Series of Lessons on the Constellations—a Dissertation on the Fixed Stars, &c. By J. Middleton.

Bells and Pomegranates.—A Blot in the 'Scutcheon. By Robert Browning, author of 'Paracelsus.'

National Distresses and National Sins. By J. C. Gallaway, A.M.

Reasons for Seceding from Conference Methodism, containing a brief view of the arbitrary power claimed and exercised by Wesleyan Methodist Ministers. By John Cropp. Third thousand.

The True Law of Population shown to be connected with the Food of the People. Second Edition. By Thomas Doubleday, Esq.

England and her Interests.—The 'Times' and the Government, and the Anti-Corn Law League considered. By John White, A.M.

The Holy Bible: accompanied throughout with a brief Hermeneutic and Exegetical Commentary, and Revised Version. By the Rev. P. J. Hussey, D.D. Part I.

The History of Woman in England, and her Influence on Society and Literature, from the earliest period. By Hannah Lawrence. Vol. I.—to the year 1200.

Elements of Universal History, on a New and Systematic Plan, from the Earliest Times to the Treaty of Vienna. For the Use of Schools and Private Students. By H. White, B.A., Trin. Coll., Cambridge.

'Enter into thy Closet;' or, Secret Prayer, and its accompanying exercises. By the Rev. James M'Gill.

Sermons, preached in Park Chapel, Chelsea. By the Rev. J. C. Miller, M.A.

THE

ECLECTIC REVIEW

For APRIL, 1843.

Art. I. 1. *Inaugural Lecture on Modern History, with Appendix.* By Thomas Arnold, D.D. Delivered at Oxford, December 1841.

2. *Preface to the Third Volume of Thucydides.* By the same.

Several of our contemporaries have already been employed in paying the tribute of admiration and regret so richly due to the lamented author of these and other works; and while our hearts deeply sympathize with that which has been already poured forth, we feel that we might do him an injustice in attempting to appreciate his merit, socially, intellectually, or spiritually. It is not our intention to swell the echo of the dirge which has been drawn forth by genuine feeling, and by the sorrows 'in which the stranger intermeddleth not.' Let it suffice to indicate that we do not undervalue him; and that if we are about to canvass freely, to oppose, and, as far as we are able, to refute, his sentiments on one important point, it is precisely because we so esteem his judgment upon others. Arguments such as we are about to adduce, assume consequence in our eyes, solely because they are deliberately advanced by Dr. Arnold, and dutifully received by many of his admirers.

The subject which we have to discuss is not at all strange to these pages; but the views to which we now find our own in contrast, *are* rather strange, in modern days at least; so that the argument becomes less hackneyed. Dr. Arnold's sentiments concerning the relations of State and Church, at first strike some persons as so extraordinary, that they find it difficult to believe him sincere. We have known those who imagined that he held them as a kind of shift, to enable him to stand his ground within the pale of the establishment, and to give him *something* to say, where nothing good could be said. On the contrary, there are

numerous proofs that he was an ardent admirer of his own theory. He cannot avoid going out of his way, even in his notes to Thucydides, besides the more formal statement in his preface, to inculcate what he deems so important truth. In his 'Inaugural Lecture on Modern History,' where no one could have expected such a thing, he devotes several pages to the topic; and not satisfied with this, has annexed an appendix of thirty-three pages to fortify his position against Mr. Gladstone, the Archbishop of Dublin, and Mr. Gladstone's Edinburgh Reviewer.

Dr. Arnold entitles his own views, *The Moral Theory of a State*. By giving it this name, he gains for his argument an apparent advantage, and betrays, we think, a misapprehension of those who, like ourselves, would oppose him. Of this we shall afterwards speak more at length. On the ground that the State is, or ought to be, a moral power, he claims for it a right to legislate on religious matters, and to punish wickedness *as such;* to become the spiritual educator of the nation; to establish and endow religious teachers, and to eject men from political or even social privileges, because of a want of conformity to the State religion. He alleges that these high powers may be, and often are, used tyrannically; but he will not allow that to use them *at all* is overstepping the rights of sovereignty. How to reconcile the just freedom of individuals with those rights, he declares to be a question than which he 'knows none more difficult,' (p. 55, Lectures;) but he maintains that it exists equally in the system of his opponents. To *persecution* his whole nature and his uniform conduct were as adverse as some of his principles appear favourable; and if such deductions are made from them by us, they would undoubtedly have been disowned by him. In his view, community of religion is an essential element of nationality; and a dissenter from the national religion is a sort of foreigner in the country. Dr. Arnold would have him treated with all the kindness which aliens ought to receive, but regards a claim of admission to equal rights in the State as quite preposterous. He teaches that the State may, with equal justice, adopt the 'New Testament as its law, or the institutes and code of Justinian.'—(p. 53.) Finally, he does not shrink to declare that the State is the perfect Church.

'When I speak then of a State requiring obedience to the Christian law, it means that the State, *being the perfect Church*,* should do the Church's work; that is, that it should provide for the Christian education of the young, and the Christian instruction of the old; that it should, by public worship and by *a Christian discipline*, endeavour, as

* Here, as elsewhere, the italics, or capitals, in the passages quoted, are our own.

much as may be, *to realize Christianity to all its people.* Under such a system, the teachers would speak because they believed, (for Christian teachers, as a general rule, do so,) and their hearers would, in like manner, learn to believe also, &c. &c.'—p. 61, Lectures.

This is but one passage out of many, which, taken by itself, might send a reader away with no other feeling than that of wonder at the author's singular extravagance. We must, however, add, that he does not pretend that his theory can be at present realized; he is merely describing his own *beau ideal* of a State, and tries to point out the direction in which we ought to strive. Instead of desecrating the functions of the State by alleging that religion is beyond its sphere, he desires to sanctify the hearts and persons of statesmen, and make their measures pure, righteous, and Christian; and if they are not so yet, he would reply—Neither (alas!) are ecclesiastics much better; but that it is no reason for desecrating the church.

'If men run away with the mistaken notion that liberty of conscience is threatened only by a *State* religion, and not at all by a *Church* religion, the danger is that they will abandon religion altogether to what they call the Church; that is, *to the power of a society far worse governed than most States*, and likely to lay far heavier burdens on individual conscience, *because the spirit dominant in it is narrower and more intolerant.*'—p. 59.

This seems to give a little more insight into his views. He is acted upon not solely by love for the power of the State in religious matters, but perhaps quite as forcibly by dread of 'what they call the Church.' In truth there is something here which dissenters often overlook; and yet the present state of the Wesleyan body might sufficiently admonish them of it. Undesirable in the abstract—and in our firm belief wholly unchristian—as is the exercise of any religious compulsion by the State, it is not an uncompensated evil; nor is it certain that a sudden and entire renunciation of all control over religion on the part of the State, would not exceedingly increase the power of social persecution in the hands of the (so-called) Church, unless the minds of its adherents were first emancipated. This we throw out for consideration, and return to Dr. Arnold. Let us hear his fundamental principles on the subject of national authority.

'Turning then to regard the inner life of a nation, we cannot but see that here, as in the life of an individual, it is determined *by the nature of its ultimate end.* What is a nation's main object, is therefore a question which must be asked, before we can answer whether its inner life (and consequently its outward life also, which depends upon the inner life) is to be called good or evil. *Now it does not seem easy to*

conceive, that a nation can have any other object than that which is the highest object of every individual in it. If it can, then the attribute of sovereignty which is inseparable from nationality becomes the dominion of an evil principle. For suppose, for instance, that a nation, as such, is not cognizant of the notions of justice and humanity, BUT that its highest object is wealth, or dominion, or security. It then follows that the sovereign power in human life, which can influence and compel the actions of us all, is a power altogether unmoral, and yet commanding the actions of moral beings; then, evil. Again, if, BEING cognizant of the notions of justice and humanity, IT DELIBERATELY PREFERS *other objects* to them, then here is the dominion of an evil principle still more clearly. But if it be cognizant of them, and appreciates them rightly, then it must see that they are more to be followed than any objects of outward advantage; then it acknowledges moral ends as a higher good than physical ends; and thus, as we said, agrees with every good individual man in its estimate of the highest object of national no less than of individual life.'—pp. 12, 13, Lectures.

Perhaps no other passage can be found which so concisely and fully sets forth the argumentative basis on which Dr. Arnold deliberately placed his doctrine; nevertheless, we doubt whether it ought to be looked on as really his main argument. It certainly appears to us exceedingly fallacious, and void even of plausibility.

We object, in the outset, to all *à priori* speculations of this nature, worthy more of a mystical dreamer like Plato, than of an historical inquirer like Dr. Arnold. If any one wishes to learn the *ultimate object* of any of the great phenomena of history, he must analyze the progress of events, and so seek for the solution; and not settle the question by an abstract syllogism, as here. But we, moreover, complain that the passage quoted derives a sophistical help from the use of ambiguous terms. First, the phrase *ultimate end,* or *object,* is capable of so many meanings, that we are quite perplexed to follow the reasoning. Even in far simpler questions it involves extreme uncertainty. If asked, what was the ultimate end or object of a *ship,* one person would reply, to carry goods and passengers over the sea; another, to keep up intercourse between different nations; a third, to diffuse the blessings of civilization and religion; a fourth, the glory of God. Again, if the 'end' of the matrimonial relation were discussed, it might be urged that the physical and social uses of it are quite secondary, and that its highest and true object is, the spiritual benefit of the married parties; and hence it might be inferred that a husband's primary and essential duty is, to instruct his wife in spiritual things, and that he ought to exact of her a submission to his religious ordinances. Undoubtedly, *all* the relations of human life may be consecrated by us,

so far as they are lawful; and ought to be so: but we are involved in endless absurdity, if we insist that what may be called in some sense the *ultimate* end, is the end by which the nature of the relationship is determined and its duties ascertained. The religious mind cannot deny that the glory of God is the true *ultimate end* of every human thing; and of course, it is likewise the end of national existence. Dr. Arnold, as it were, shames us into a confession that the 'highest object' of a nation must be something of religious and moral value; and proceeds to infer that a nation ought to endow churches, to exclude dissenters, &c. He might equally infer the same of every shipowner, and every community soever. Again, the word *nation* is also ambiguous. By the phrase 'object of a nation,' he seems to mean 'object of *national existence*,'—i. e., the design of *God* in allowing nations to exist. Yet presently he uses it to mean *national government*, which is wholly a different thing. If it be said that he meant this all along, we complain of an unfair advantage gained by the phraseology; for there would be nothing plausible in assuming that the end of *worldly government* is spiritual goodness; whereas by putting the word *nation* in the place of the other expression, he probably wins the assent of many. A similar advantage is gained by the use of the term 'inner life' for the public administration, laws, and institutions, which are really nothing but an *outer* life. In contrast to the foreign affairs of a nation, its home affairs may certainly be called *inner;* but in this connexion the sound of the word imposes on the unwary reader, as if, whatever is *inner*, (for instance, an Act of Parliament!) were therefore spiritual. It appears to us, moreover, a great mistake, to speak of the public acts of statesmen as '*the* national life.' What is vaguely called the 'government,' even in the freest states, is only *one* particular outward manifestation of national life; and, in fact, the great mass of nearly every nation takes no part in it whatever. We further demur to his statement, that sovereignty has anything to do with nationality. In proof of the contrary, we appeal to the case of India, where we see the British to be sovereign, not because they have any nationality or 'inner life' in common with the Hindoos, but because physical force is in their hand. While that is the case, no one else is able to repress injustice and maintain peace; but they *are* able. This fact constitutes in them a duty to use their power for good, and while they so use it, it becomes a duty in the subjects to obey. Such is at least our view of the case; and, we suspect, Dr. Arnold's too. Now it is contrary to all fact, that the organ in which the maximum physical force resides, concentrates in itself the highest and inner life of the nation; why then ascribe to it the duties of a spiritual body?

Dr. Arnold endeavours to evade the objection, that his argu-

ment would apply equally to all other associations, by laying stress on the fact, that the State is the only one which possesses 'sovereignty,' and can 'influence and compel the actions of us all;' and, *therefore*, we should establish the dominion of an evil principle, in conceding that the State is an 'unmoral' institution. If this is to the purpose, it assumes the very point which is denied. By 'unmoral,' Dr. Arnold of course here means 'non-spiritual;' (for *we* also hold the State and every other human association whatever, to be *moral*,) and he rightly infers that it cannot be a non-spiritual institution, if it is to be justified in 'compelling' us as to spiritual matters. We, however, are so far from admitting this, as to maintain that such compulsion is not a function of the State at all, but is a violent and wrongful usurpation. True: but the State (perhaps he means) has the power of compulsion, and, therefore, surely must have the right! We deny the inference, and we do not wholly grant the fact. That it has not the power of compelling *belief*, is certain; and is acknowledged by Dr. Arnold: and its power of compelling *obedience*, is limited. The Roman emperors were not able to compel Christians to cast incense on the altar of Jupiter; Philip of Spain could not force his Dutch subjects to worship the Host. On the other hand, it daily happens that our lives are at the mercy of other men, as much as they are at the mercy of a king, or of a parliament; but the fact of their being *able* to kill us, (if this is what is meant by 'compelling us to religious duties,') does not constitute them guides of our religious actions, or educators of our children.

When he uses the wide phrase '*influence* or compel,' he reminds us that there are thousands of persons more under the influence of the Bank of England and the Birmingham railroad, than of the Queen's cabinet; but this does not constitute a spiritual relationship. Indeed, he afterwards lays stress on the compulsory power exercised by excommunication, in proof that *other* organizations, besides that called the State, may tempt men to hypocrisy by punishing their want of orthodoxy. This is true; but it proves too much. Since a bank or a post-office may deprive a man of his bread, by arbitrarily discharging him for heterodoxy, *therefore* the relation between the parties is a spiritual one; *therefore*, those in power are justified in choosing a religion for the inferior; and *therefore*, his ejection, however harsh, is not an overstepping of their proper functions!

Further: let us suppose, for argument's sake, a state of things, in which the supreme government should be of pure and angelic perfection; but in which, at the same time, every subordinate society should be wholly corrupt; every company of bankers, of merchants, of shipowners, every society for insurance, every petty meeting, and every partnership of trade, void of faith,

honour, justice, mercy. We ask, whether to live in such a nation would be bearable to any good man, and whether the goodness of the central '*moral*' union could make up for the badness of the local and secondary '*unmoral*' ones. It is evident that it would not; and that to make human life worth having, there must be morality in the smaller societies, as well as in the greater one; in those to which we do not concede the power of life and death, as much as in that to which we do concede it. How then can the last-named point of difference between them reconcile Dr. Arnold to the idea, that a banking company may, without reprehension, and without evil consequences, be *un*moral, but that a State must not and cannot be? What guarantee, moreover, does he think that we get for the good behaviour of governors, by laying down that government is to be moral *in some other sense* than that in which *all* societies are to be moral? It seems to us, that the sentiment, if believed, paves the ready road towards the 'dominion of an evil principle,' for it destroys all test of morality.

We must proceed to call attention to the words which we have placed in small capitals. He makes two suppositions, which, he seems to think, exhaust the alternatives which may be held against him. First, that a nation (as such) is not cognizant at all of justice and humanity; secondly, that being cognizant of them, it is yet deliberately (and therefore wickedly) to prefer other objects to them! We are really amazed at so extravagant and gratuitous a misrepresentation. By way of illustration, let us consider the case of a ship company, as that of the owners of the Great Western, who combined to build and store the vessel, and send her, duly fitted out, on a mercantile enterprise from Bristol to New York. Their avowed immediate and sufficient object is, pecuniary gain; and, therefore, in Dr. Arnold's view, it is an unmoral society, and is not bound to unite in common worship, or to refuse Jew and Parsee shareholders; while, as it does not possess the power of religious compulsion, (i. e. the right over life and death,) it can be thus *un*moral, without becoming *im*moral. Now, is it nevertheless true that this company is 'not cognizant at all of JUSTICE?' So far otherwise, that all hope of permanent *gain* on the part of the company, as all hope of *security* to a nation, is obviously and avowedly based upon the strict observance of justice. But let us pass to MERCY. We suppose the Great Western to fall in with a ship on fire, and to deviate from her course to save the unfortunate persons exposed to so terrible a calamity. No man of common sense will infer that the Great Western Company was established for the purposes of mercy, and that this, not money, is, in fact, 'its real and highest end.' Men, though knit into associations, do not the less carry

within them human hearts and souls. The Great Western saves the men from the burning ship, not because mercy is the 'object' of the Company, as such, but because her captain and sailors retain the feelings of humanity; and the shareholders at home, knowing that nothing but a ship at hand can succour a ship on fire, for the very same reason justify the captain, though it may have involved the uncompensated expense of several days' steaming. On the other hand, to occupy the vessel in assisting any spiritual object, however excellent, (suppose the planting of a missionary colony,) to the pecuniary loss of the shareholders, would be wholly unjustifiable; unless their previous and unanimous consent had been obtained, or unless the consenting majority indemnified the dissenting minority.

Now every word of this will apply equally to States, so as to exculpate our views from Dr. Arnold's reprehension and misapprehension. First, we do not hold a State to have nothing to do with justice, but everything; and that, (not *although*, but) *because* we maintain that its primary and sufficient object is security. We, moreover, fearlessly affirm, that no party and no individuals in England have so boldly upheld the duty of the State, to act on principles of justice, as those who teach that security is the proper and adequate end of government. Whether among churchmen or among dissenters, as a general rule, the very same persons who have been in favour of the voluntary system, in regard to national religion, have also protested, on the ground of justice, against slavery, against wanton wars, and against class-legislation. If we wish to find men who maintain, that for the sake of imagined expediency a government may violate the common laws of justice, we must look chiefly to the ranks of those who, like Sir Robert Inglis, impose taxes on men of different religion from themselves, while declaring that it would be against their own conscience to pay similar ones in turn. One more quotation on this subject we must produce:—

'It is allowed by those who object to the moral theory of a State, that Christian legislators did well in forcibly suppressing gladiatorial shows and impure rites, 'as being immoral and pernicious actions;' but *if the legislator has anything to do with morality, the whole question is conceded;* for morality is surely not another name for expediency, or what is advantageous for body and goods; yet if it be not, and a legislator may prohibit any practice because it is wicked, then he regards moral ends, and his care is directed towards man's highest happiness, and to the putting down his greatest misery, moral evil, &c.' —p. 69, Lectures.

There is here a strange inability to see distinctions that are to most common and practical men very obvious, and a greedi-

ness of seizing on a supposed concession, which astonishes us in such a mind. It is avowed by his opponents that the State does well to suppress 'immoral and *pernicious* actions,' which Dr. Arnold interprets as if it had been said, 'immoral actions, *as such*, and *even if they be not pernicious* to the body and goods of others beside the immediate agent.' He moreover appropriates to his views the title, 'The *moral* theory of a State,' to which name we feel that our own doctrine has a far greater right, except that we do not allow it to be a *theory* at all: but on this we shall presently dilate. Let us once more recur to the Great Western. We are at liberty to suppose that one of the directors had been found to be a confirmed drunkard, and that the Company, in disgust and dread of this 'immoral and pernicious' habit, had removed him from his office. Might we not justify his removal without allowing Dr. Arnold's inference, that the end of the Great Western was 'man's highest happiness, and the putting down of his greatest misery, moral evil'?

It is to us incredible that Dr. Arnold could mean to say that all wickedness is to be punished by law. No machinery could be invented to reach a hundredth part of the notorious sin that exists in the purest nation in the world; and a line must be drawn somewhere. We do not admit that sin is ever to be punished *because* it deserves God's judgment in a future world, but only because it is injurious to the welfare of the community in this world. If it cannot be proved to demoralize others, and so *to make them worse citizens*, or *to incapacitate the individual himself for his duties as a citizen*, then let the deed, however sinful, pass without notice by the law. If it be a disgusting and loathsome one, let it be punished socially by the stigma of public opinion: should, however, the tone of social morals be too low for this, then it is probable that no law would really be executed. We are not therefore frightened by his inference, that, according to this, certain abominations ought not to be counted criminal, although we are by no means of opinion that the inference is just.

The practical legislator has two main questions to consider: first, what enactments are intrinsically good as national and compulsory measures; next, whether the moral state of the nation is such as to make it possible to execute them. An English parliament certainly ought not to allow an Indian prince to open in Middlesex or Surrey what might be called a Hindoo Temple, but would be a brothel. The civil power would rightly suppress it, because of its being *injurious to society*;* not because God

* Most immoral habits can be proved to 'incapacitate men for some of their civil duties; and when this is the case, the state in punishing them

will also punish, at the day of judgment, the sin thence ensuing. On the other hand, it is less clear that the Indian government ought with a high hand to put down such nuisances in India. A new question there arises,—whether the dark conscience of the community might not see the act as one of impious persecution; whether it might not call out in them an evil enthusiasm on the side of their superstitions, and the mischief recur in other forms, and with greater malignity, until by moral agencies their minds became more enlightened. Whether this view, which is one of common sense, daily acted on, and no refinement of modern voluntaries, be true or not, (though we seem to have the authority of Moses, and of one greater than Moses, with us,) it certainly deserved a fairer statement and refutation than it has received from Dr. Arnold.

In confessing the practical difficulty of reconciling the rights of individual conscience with those of the State, he retorts, that it exists equally even if his theory be abandoned. We allow that *some* difficulty remains; but the whole weight of his objections falls on Mr. Gladstone, or on the Archbishop of Dublin, not on us. For he urges that a national Church, and much more, a *Catholic* Church, has a fearful power of social persecution if not controlled by the State, since excommunication may be a blighting infliction equivalent to martyrdom. It certainly may; and this is one more proof of the superiority of the congregational system of Church government to the national; since in the latter, the official organs of the Church necessarily become so powerful in this world, that the State must either seize them as its own, or be conquered by them. And in spite of Dr. Arnold's historical criticism on the Archbishop of Dublin's remarks, it appears to us that their spirit is true, even though their mode of expression may be unguarded. We do think that the *later* and most cruel persecutions suffered by the Christian Church, under Decius and Diocletian, were largely prompted by fear of so dangerous a confederacy; and that those politic emperors discerned that it either must be dissolved, or would become too powerful for the empire; as it actually did.

does not go beyond the limits which we regard to be its own. If the Emperor of China were to confiscate, in whole or part, the goods of those who ruin their minds and bodies by opium, he might, or he might not, be unwise; but *we* should have no prima facie ground for protesting against his act. In our view, the reason for winking at drunkenness is, because (in one way or other) the evils contingent on a law to punish it would be worse to society than the existing evil. To speak generally, the law cannot deal with *habits* as such, it can deal only with *acts*. Where it is requisite to discriminate degrees of punishment, more discretion needs to be placed in the hands of judges or jury than they could be safely trusted with in such matters.

But we must pass to the practical modifications of his theory to which we above alluded. It has been seen what high pretensions he advances for the State as being 'the perfect Church;' elsewhere he argues, like a Greek philosopher, that 'the sovereign authority' must be not a mere 'subordinate teacher,' but the 'parental educator;' 'must regulate our particular lessons, and determine that we shall study most what is of most value.' p. 49. After reading so frightful an account of the mental slavery in which we are all to be held, it is comforting to learn (p. 53) that 'a government may not impose *its own* law, *whether human or divine*, upon an adverse people;' though 'a nation, acting through its government, may certainly *choose for itself* such a law as it deems most for its good;' and the only question remains, 'How far the nation or society may impose its law on a number of dissentient individuals.' (p. 54.) Thus the sovereign authority is clearly marked out as having no intrinsic right, by virtue of its organization as the government, to dictate what shall be learned or believed, but merely a right *delegated* to it from the unorganized majority of the nation; since Dr. Arnold himself has virtually reduced the question to this,—'What right have nine units of mankind to punish a tenth for not conforming to their religious worship?' We think he has made it manifest that the true reply is, '*None at all.*'

But we here touch on another point. Dr. Arnold is aware that nothing will compel religious *belief;* all that he demands is *external conformity.* Nor is he terrified by the objection that this is 'no other than the system of the old philosophers, who upheld paganism as expedient, while they laughed at it in their hearts as false' (p. 60); for he says, Christianity is so excellent, that *if* the State were but (!) the perfect Church, unbelief would be of rare occurrence, and perhaps might come to 'shock men's notions of right and wrong, as much as obscene writings now.' This is no reply at all; for in the interval, *before* that millennial state is gained, the system offers every premium to hypocrisy; and indeed, by demoralizing State functionaries, retards the happy period for which he legislates; and *after* it shall arrive, these enactments will be perfectly needless. 'States and Churches,' says he, 'should make their bond to consist in a common object and common practice, rather than in a common belief: in other words, their end should be *good* rather than *truth.*' (p. 50.) Be it so: but to hold out a bonus for hypocrisy does not promote *good.* Not a single bad man will be kept out, nor a single additional good man gained, in any office of State, high or low, by such exclusions or compulsions.

At the bottom of all his views, it appears to us that there are several erroneous assumptions, which, though he does not make

them prominent, we should call his main points. First, he assumes that common national worship is a thing intrinsically beneficial to a nation, so that a man who (unhappily) cannot join in it, is a worse citizen than another who can, and is in a manner self-excluded from all public acting. But we deny the main point. Public worship, and what is called 'conformity,' is a pure evil, and not a good, when it is done from hypocrisy. It is therefore preposterous to demand the outward action as an end good in itself, as Dr. Arnold would do. We will not here enlarge on the topic (which yet we are persuaded cannot be disproved), that if exclusion from public posts is a justifiable punishment for nonconformity, as Dr. Arnold thinks, it is impossible to stop short there; but the infliction of pecuniary fines ('head-money' exacted of *aliens* for leave to reside in the country!) becomes also justifiable; and this being allowed, there is no principle left for condemning banishment, especially if these 'aliens' insist on teaching and propagating their doctrines.

Next, closely akin to this, is the assumption that religion is *one element* of nationality. (Dr. Arnold counts four;—viz., blood, language, religion, and institutions, as necessary to make nationality perfect.) We think it is quite as just to say, that being educated at the same school is one element of brotherhood. 'Whether two men are or are not of the same nation,' it does not need philosophy to decide; it is a matter of common fact, quite as much as the question whether they are brothers. To be born of English parents, and on the soil of England, undoubtedly constitutes a man a full and perfect Englishman. He is liable to be claimed as such by the law, whatever his religious sentiments may be. He is loaded with taxes, forbidden to eat foreign corn, liable to be pressed into the militia, or (haply!) to be cruelly carried off by a naval pressgang. It is only by leave that he can go abroad, and even in foreign countries he can be claimed as a British subject by our queen's officers. It is absurd to pretend that such a one is either more or less an Englishman, because of his secret or professed creed. Common religion may become *a bond* of nationality, as common education a bond of brotherhood; to the historian also it is a valuable test, or rather *clue*, in the case of barbarians; but it is no *element*, or ingredient of nationality. In fact, the integrant parts of our own empire have different public religious institutions. Dr. Arnold, indeed, may regard the English, Scotch, and Canadian religion as the same, because all are called Christianity; but the law does not deal with them as the same, nor is it practically true that protestantism and catholicism are (to English subjects who profess them) even a bond of nationality.

A third error, an extraordinary confusion of *morals* with

religion, is constantly showing itself in Dr. Arnold's reasonings. This we regard with perfect horror, as tending to renew the ages of bloody persecution and religious war. Strange as it may seem to impute such confusion to him, we think he justifies us, even by entitling his own views the *moral*, when it is so evident that he ought to have said the *spiritual* theory of a State. Farther; from the doctrines held by the Archbishop of Dublin, he deduces, that it would have been essentially wrong for the Christians of the Roman empire, in later times, to extinguish slavery, and gladiatorial combats, and the impure rites of Flora. 'True it is,' says he, 'that to us these institutions appear immoral or unjust, *because Christianity has taught us so to regard them*; but to a Roman they were privileges, or powers, or pleasures, which he could ill bear to abandon.' Yet Dr. Arnold knew as well as any man that the conscience of heathens is abundantly susceptible of seeing the moral evil of these things, and their injuriousness to a community; and he cannot have meant anything so wild, as that *we* believe them to be immoral, solely on the authority of miraculous and external testimony. Nevertheless, in the preface to his third volume of 'Thucydides,' we find the same hallucination, in his protest against the recognition of Jews as members of our nation, on the ground that this would throw our morality into confusion. It is the more extraordinary, since in the existing system, of which he does not appear to have disapproved, all that is necessary for a member of parliament is, to use the words, 'on the faith of a Christian;' and as each may interpret this for himself, men may decide (as many do) that they are 'Christians,' though they wholly reject the miraculous side of Christianity and all its distinguishing doctrines, neglect all its ordinances, and, in short, neither perform nor believe more than a Jew of cultivated mind.

We allowed that difficulties might exist in reconciling the rights of conscience and the rights of the State. One of the most striking among ourselves is, in the opposition to war-taxes on the part of the Quakers, and in the occasional endeavours to distribute among the soldiery tracts which inculcate the unlawfulness of their profession. But such difficulties must always arise, in proportion as political morals are uncertain, or are confounded with religion. At a very early period, the purer religions took morals under their care, and governments which began by assisting and ordaining religious ceremonies, soon proceeded to enforce them. After this, it became natural and ordinary to confound morals and religion, and it was only gradually that men could learn that the things of Cæsar and the things of God are separate. Dr. Arnold urges that he has on his side the great minds of every age; but we think he exceed-

ingly mistakes. *His* views are widely opposed to those of the old times, for he warmly condemns religious persecution. He wishes to admit the old principles, and to reject the old, natural, and necessary conclusions—a mere Quixotic attempt, we are persuaded. We quite admit that it is a *very old* error for the State to grasp at religious authority, but it is older still for the Priesthood to control the State; and of this Dr. Arnold strongly disapproves. 'The State cannot abandon its responsibility,' says he (p. 65, Lectures), 'and surrender its conscience up into the hands of a Priesthood, who have no knowledge superior to its own, and who cannot exercise its sovereignty.' What has sovereignty to do with the difficulty of yielding up one's conscience? If the Priesthood may yield it up to the State, why may not the State yield up its own to a Priesthood? and if a Priesthood is not likely to have more knowledge than the State, is it not at least as uncertain whether a majority of the nation will be wiser than a minority? If it is unlawful (as Dr. Arnold heartily believed it) for an individual to yield up his conscience, how can it be lawful in a State, more than in a Priesthood, to expect or wish it? There is no end of the incongruities which we find in every sentence which Dr. Arnold writes on this subject. We altogether protest against the idea, that stress is to be laid on *what* former ages have thought, instead of asking *in what direction* men's minds have expanded; and it is our unhesitating belief that the progress of growing intelligence has been uniformly towards that limitation of the functions of the State for which we contend. On the one hand, every great extension of worldly empire has either led rulers to discover that religion is not their sphere, or has produced results so cruel and horrible as to convince others of it: on the other hand, every great development of religious feeling has led to a diffusion of the same truth. Christ himself most markedly lays down, between the things of Cæsar and the things of God, a distinction, which Dr. Arnold appears as pointedly to declare not to exist at all.

'The words *secular* and *temporal* have no place in this question, unless we believe that the God of this world is really and truly not the God of the next, and that temporal things therefore are subject to a different government from things eternal,' &c. &c.—*Lectures*, p. 70.

The spread of the Christian religion in the first place, the Reformation at a later time, the rise of sects among the protestants—in short, every great movement of spiritual life which history narrates, has had the very same tendency. In those points which still lie on debateable ground,—i.e., which some allege to be things of God, and others to be things of Cæsar, matter for persecution must of course remain: but we assert

that the whole progress of human intellect has at all times been towards the establishing, with a more and more perfect sharpness, the division between morals and spirituals.

But, as we before said, we do not allow our own views to be a *theory* at all. We maintain that the truth is every day avowed and acted upon by all practical statesmen when put to the proof, and we claim Mr. Gladstone himself on our side. That gentleman does not desire the English government to intermeddle with the religion of the people of India, yet he holds that the Hindoos owe to our authorities the obedience and respect of subjects to rulers. This brings the whole question to a practical test in a very short compass. The duties of rulers and subjects are reciprocal. The nominal sovereign cannot claim to be any longer acknowledged as such, if he neglects his essential duties: *what* then are those duties, the performance of which on his part entitles him to say,—'Acknowledge me as your ruler, and yield to me obedience?' It is notorious that every power, as long as it impartially protects the persons and property of its subjects, thinks it has an ample right to demand their homage: and in this, we are satisfied, both Mr. Gladstone and Dr. Arnold will justify every government. It is words without sense to pretend that religious instruction is 'the primary function' of a government, while it is admitted that this function may be utterly and permanently neglected without absolving the subject from his allegiance. To talk about the superior *importance* of spiritual to worldly objects, is throwing dust into our eyes; as if the fact of having the care of armies and of finance on his shoulders made a monarch more able to provide for the spiritual welfare of his subjects, than each man for his own soul, and every wise man for that of his neighbour. We are really amazed at the stress laid by Dr. Arnold on the possession of worldly force. To control a mass of soldiers, or of policemen, is no doubt essential for him who is to enforce justice, and to maintain the peace, and to ward off foreign foes; but how it is connected with *spiritual* things Dr. Arnold gives us no hint, and yet always assumes the connexion as a fact. On the other hand, nothing is more certain than that the undisputed possession of power corrupts men's hearts; that the struggle for it when disputed leads to a thousand demoralizing practices; that courts and cabinets are anything but the strong holds of virtue or of pure religion; that the habit of making religion a tool of State has had the most baneful tendencies; that the average morality attainable in public government must always fall at least somewhat below that which exists in the private life of the upper and middle classes; that the government, in consequence, can never be a higher reservoir of spiritual good, but, on the contrary, always tends to be a sink

of impure waters; and that wherever it has affected a superior purity, the result has been peculiarly disastrous. The great abomination of the papal sway in Italy, after the fall of the old Roman empire, consisted in the popes' wearing so high a profession of piety, while their political position could not possibly be maintained by a scrupulous conscience. To say that a priest cannot act the king, but that a king can act the priest, without injury, is to us an unmeaning distinction. Nevertheless, what says Dr. Arnold?

'I believe that the end and object of a Christian kingdom or commonwealth is precisely the same with that of a Christian Church, and *that the separation of the two has led to the grievous corruption of both, making the State worldly and profane, and the Church formal, superstitious, and idolatrous,*' &c. &c.—p. 66.

Dr. Arnold is here upon his own ground—history; and we must presume that he wrote advisedly, yet the statement is to us absolutely unintelligible. When was the *separation* first made? Does he mean that there was some early and happy period when the State was *not* worldly and profane, and the separation had *not yet* taken place? And when was 'the Church' *other than* formal, superstitious, and idolatrous? Whether we look to Pagans, Christians, Protestants, or Catholics, for a reply, we are equally embarrassed in obtaining one which shall suit his argument; and we are driven to suppose that the age of Moses, King David, or Hezekiah, is the pattern time which he had before his eyes. Another assumption silently made in the last passage, appears to pervade his views,—that the relationship between subjects and rulers is in some way altered by their Christian profession. Originally, he discussed the ultimate end of a commonwealth as such, but now, he slips in, '*Christian* commonwealth,' as though the end of *it* were different; or rather, he does not seem to be aware that this is an assuming of the main point,—viz., that a commonwealth, *as such*, ought to be Christian at all, which we pointedly deny. Quite consistently indeed, Dr. Arnold holds that the State ought to exercise a 'Christian discipline.' It ought therefore to exclude from places of power all who are excluded from the Lord's supper. A wanton king must be deposed; a Lord Mayor who causes scandal by gluttony must do (we suppose) religious penance. If he confesses that we are at present far enough from the possibility of executing such a scheme, what, we ask, is gained by executing one petty portion of it? What advantage is there in excluding those who conscientiously dissent from (what is called) the national religion,—be it what it may, more or less comprehensive, more or less pure,—if it is obviously impossible to exclude the immoral, the worldly,

the grasping, the hypocritical, the careless, the ignorant, the every-way unprincipled? How miserable the satisfaction of saying,—'True: we cannot keep out all the raff and rabble who choose to call themselves of our religion, while they disgrace it every day; but at least we do keep out those who fairly tell us that they are not of our religion at all; and a valuable *principle* is hereby maintained by us.' Dr. Arnold devoutly trusts (and we with him) that a time shall come when the lion shall lie down with the lamb; but meanwhile, we would not cast our lambs into the lion's jaws. Out of the eater may come forth meat, and out of the strong, sweetness; but until such miracles are of daily occurrence, we cannot expect spirituality to spread from the organ of worldly supremacy. As to the phrase, 'Christian commonwealth,' 'Christian kingdom,' &c., it is argumentatively sophistical, and practically inculcates a political falsehood. If our allegiance to a Christian queen had anything to do with her Christianity, it would justify our rebelling should she change her religion. Christianity surely did not come into the world to give new rights to sovereigns; a Christian sovereign, therefore, can have no other rights than those which every heathen sovereign possesses. Nor does the spread of Christianity in a nation authorize Christians, upon becoming a numerical majority, to eject the minority from the senate, the magistracy, the universities, calling it thereupon a 'Christian' commonwealth. All such exclusions, under whatever specious names, are essentially unjust, and have ever had the curse of God upon them.

Art. II. *The Eastern and Western States of America.* By J. S. Buckingham, Esq. 3 Vols. London: Fisher and Co.

Our notice of the two former portions of Mr. Buckingham's work supersedes the necessity for any formal introduction of the present volumes. They partake of the same general characteristics as their predecessors; are written in an easy, flowing, and perspicuous style; are full of the results of acute observation and extensive reading, and bear evident marks of the good-will and kindly feelings entertained by their author towards the American people. The range of country included in this series extends over a much larger area than its predecessors, embracing the Eastern States of Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Connecticut, and the Western States of Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Iowa, Wisconsin, and Michigan; whilst the information given respecting the history, statistics, topography, religion, manners, and customs of the several States, is equally full and satisfactory. Exceptions may still be taken

by those who are disposed to be critical, to the use made by Mr. Buckingham of the labours of others, and to the numerous extracts from the newspapers and temporary publications of America included in his volumes. For ourselves, however, we have but slight objections to prefer on these grounds, as it is an advantage of no inconsiderable order to have included within one work whatever is interesting to the general reader in the past history, as well as in the present condition and resources of the great transatlantic community. Nor must it be supposed that our author is open to the charge of plagiarism. Nothing would be further from the truth, or more unjust to his well-earned reputation. He has made no other use of prior publications than what is perfectly just and honourable, and may challenge the gratitude of his readers for the pains he has taken to digest, and to present, within reasonable limits, the historical records of the American States. Some documents might unquestionably have been omitted, and some descriptions have been curtailed with advantage, but, on the whole, we receive the work with thankfulness, and have perused it with very considerable pleasure. The following brief statement of the views with which it was commenced is fully borne out by its execution, and may be quoted in justice to the author and his publishers.

'In closing these volumes on the United States of America, in which I have endeavoured to make my readers the companions of my journey —to put before them the facts that occurred to my own observation, and the feelings and opinions they suggested to my own mind—I have necessarily extended it beyond the ordinary space allotted to works of this description. But, when I commenced the task, I prescribed to myself no limits but those which the information I desired to convey should necessarily impose. I was neither bent on producing a larger or a smaller, a cheaper or a dearer book, than others with which it might be compared. My anxious and prominent desire was, to make it comprehensive, varied, instructive, agreeable, just, and impartial—such as should live beyond the passing hour—and be a work worthy of future reference by those really seeking accurate information on the subjects connected with America, its resources, its institutions, and its people. I venture to hope that I have, in a great degree, attained the accomplishment of my wishes ; and the commendations of private friends and public journals confirm me in this belief. The publishers, I think it will be admitted, have executed their part of the undertaking with due regard to the just proportions between price, quantity, and quality; and though the expense of the whole work is greater than that of its predecessors in the same track, because it embraces a much greater extent of country and subjects, yet it will not be denied that, even in a purely mercantile and pecuniary sense, it is much cheaper, in the proportion of materials given, to the price paid, than most of the recent works published on the United States.'—Vol. iii., pp. 474, 475.

His former tour, which occupied about two years, and embraced the Northern and Southern States, being completed, Mr. Buckingham, not unnaturally, concluded that a third year 'might be agreeably and advantageously employed' in visiting the Eastern and Western States, and to this conclusion we owe the volumes now before us. 'In such a tour,' he remarks, 'we thought we should have an opportunity of seeing the finest portion of the United States, and judging of its capacity and eligibility for the reception of emigrants from Europe, as well as of sailing down the beautiful river Ohio—ascending the giant Mississippi—and forming an accurate conception of the boundless prairies of the Western world, which we had so often heard described with enthusiasm by those who had rolled over their verdure-clad and flower-enamelled plains.'

Prior to setting out on this tour, our author remained some time at New York, to recover from the fatigues of his Southern journey. This sojourn afforded him an opportunity of making inquiry into the condition and habits of the free negroes, whom he had frequently heard disadvantageously compared with the slaves of the South. The result was such as might have been expected, and as all reasoning on the tendencies of the human mind would lead us to anticipate. The negroes of the North are represented as being 'as superior in character and condition to those of the South, as the intelligent and thriving artisan of England is to the wretched pauper of the most destitute parts of Spain; or, as the independent little landed proprietors of France are to the miserable serfs of the Russian soil.'

Whatever the Southern advocates of slavery may allege to the contrary, this superiority of the Northern negro is well known in their slave-markets, and secures for him a higher price than can be obtained for his Southern brother. Hence has arisen a diabolical scheme of kidnapping, to which Mr. Buckingham thus alludes:

'The superiority of the northern negroes, for intelligence and industry, is, indeed, so well known, that a set of miscreants obtain a livelihood by stealing them from the towns of the North, and carrying them off to the South for sale, where they fetch large prices. Facts, in proof of this practice, are abundant; and although the more honourable among the slaveholders of the South would denounce it in the strongest terms, yet it is one of the unavoidable consequences of the slave system; for where there are persons to purchase men as slaves, there will be no want of thieves to steal them from their homes for this purpose; the principle of political economy, that 'demand creates supply,' being as applicable to this as to any other commodity of traffic. The following paragraph, from a recent number of the Boston Transcript, will show that the practice is continued to the present period.

' ' The coloured lad, Sydney O. Francis, who was kidnapped by Dickinson Shearer, and sold in Virginia for 450 dollars, has been safely restored to his parents and friends at Worcester, where his father is a respectable shoemaker. The scoundrel who stole him has confessed, since his arrest and imprisonment, that he has followed the business of kidnapping for six years past, and is connected with a gang of villains, whose organization extends from New England to Virginia.—A young man by the name of Turner, not yet twenty years of age, has been arrested at Palmer, as an accomplice; and it is presumed the man Wilkinson, to whom the boy was sold by Shearer, is, in fact, one of the conspirators in this damnable business.—Another coloured lad, by the name of Hassard, of Lunenburg, in Worcester county, was also stolen, (by the same rascals, no doubt,) but has been recovered in the vicinity of Richmond, Virginia, and the man in whose possession he was found has been arrested, as an accomplice of the kidnappers.' '—Vol. i., pp. 11, 12.

During his stay at New York our author attended the ' Court of Errors,' of which he gives an account that shows it to be capable of bearing comparison with the highest legal tribunal in this country.

' While we remained at New York, the state senators were sitting daily, as a Court of Appeal, called technically a ' Court of Errors'—though the language of the law, which is so proverbial for its verbosity, might dispense with this unusual brevity, and call it by its more appropriate name, ' A Court for the correction of Errors.' As several of the senators resided at our hotel, I went occasionally to attend their sittings. These were held in the beautiful council-chamber of the City Hall, the lieutenant-governor of the state presiding, and the senators, to the number of about thirty, seated round a large table, as a select committee of the Houses of Lords or Commons in England. The lawyers pleaded, as with us, at a bar below the table; and, as all the matters of fact were settled before the case could be appealed, the pleadings were entirely directed to the question of the legality or equity of the judgment in the courts of law. Most of the senators took notes; and I learnt that no decision was given on any doubtful case, till the meeting of the legislature at Albany, in December; the intermediate period being used for consulting and conferring on the subject, when, by the mingling of lawyers and laymen, for the senators include both, they arrived at an equitable, and generally satisfactory conclusion. No sort of costume was worn by any one; but the proceedings were conducted with great dignity, and the most careful attention paid to the advocates by all present; so that, from the number of the judges, their habits and experience, and the pains bestowed by all on the consideration of the cases submitted to them in appeal, I should consider it to be a much better court for the correction of errors than our English House of Lords; where the chancellor and any two other peers form a quorum; and where the chancellor alone is often the only peer who pays the least attention to the case, which, having been already once decided by himself in the Court of Chancery, he cannot hear a second

time with the same impartiality as before. When a judge sits to hear an appeal to himself as speaker of the House of Lords, against a decision made by himself in the Court of Chancery, it requires but a slight knowledge of human nature to perceive the difficulty of an impartial hearing and unbiassed judgment in such cases, however pure, and free from all influence of a corrupt nature, the judge may be.'—Ib., pp. 18, 19.

Our traveller left New York for Maine on the 1st of October, in the hope of completing his tour through the Eastern States before the severity of winter rendered travelling impracticable. He spent some days in Boston, whose foreign trade and revenue he states to be on the increase. The morals of the town, notwithstanding individual instances of intemperance, are represented in a highly favourable light, as the following brief extract will prove.

'It may be safely asserted, that there is no town in America or England, of the same size as Boston, in which there is so little of general intemperance, or so much of order, decorum, and safety for person and property. At all hours of the day or night, men may walk in any and every part of the city and its suburbs, without the slightest danger of robbery or insult, and females may walk in perfect safety from sunset to midnight, if occasion required it, without fear of being accosted or molested by men, though there is no body of preventive police; a state of security which no large towns of England enjoy.

'The causes of this superiority here, are many, but among them may be numbered these:—First, the certainty with which every one who is sober and industrious can earn an honest and an ample subsistence; Secondly, the almost universal habit of early marriage, the means of providing for families being within every one's reach; Thirdly, the equal diffusion of education, which gives to all the youths, of both sexes, a taste for intellectual pleasures, and substitutes lectures and exhibitions in art, science, and manufactures, for the theatre, the masquerade, and the ball; Fourthly, the strong moral sentiment against intemperance, and the legislative destruction or abolition of those facilities which dram-shops afford in most large cities for this pernicious indulgence. The law is now in full operation, which prohibits the sale of spirits in any less quantities than fifteen gallons at a time, which of course puts an end entirely to the practice of retailing it out by the bottle or the glass; and this law works so well, and has received so strongly the approbation of the general community, that it is to be hoped its example will before long be followed in England, where it would produce a greater change in the habits and aspects of the lower classes of society, and effect a greater reform in the health, industry, and morals of the labouring population, than any act of legislation ever yet devised.'—Ib., pp. 46, 47.

America comprises within itself the extremes of human life. Some portions of its people are familiar with the higher forms of civilization, whilst others touch upon the region of barbarism,

and partake largely of its features. Its cities rival those of Europe in their luxurious habits and prodigal expenditure, whilst its vast wildernesses conceal a hardy and reckless race, whom no dangers can terrify, and few principles restrain. Travelling from Bagnor to Augusta by the stage, Mr. Buckingham was thrown into the company of one of the class called 'lumber men,' from whom he learnt some interesting particulars respecting these 'hewers of wood' during their winter residence in the forest.

'It is the practice for a body of men, varying from twenty to fifty, to furnish themselves with a corresponding number of teams of oxen, three yoke in each team, and large open waggons for draft; and laying in a stock of provisions for nine months, consisting chiefly of flour, pork, and coffee, to set out for the frontier of the disputed territory, and there, building themselves logsheds, to encamp for the winter, without women or children. Here they remain from November to May, cutting down trees, barking and otherwise preparing them for floating down the river. When reduced to the proper lengths, and completely stripped of branches and bark, they are drawn by the teams to the river's bank, then shut up by ice, and there deposited within booms, until the opening of the summer shall thaw the river, when they are floated down in rafts to the saw-mills on the Penobscot, and there reduced to planks and shingles for the Bangor market. The cold is here much greater, it is said, than at Bangor, though in that city it is common for the mercury to descend to thirty degrees below zero almost every winter, and instances of forty and forty-five degrees have been occasionally known. With this intense cold, however, there is always a bright sun, and all parties seem to represent the atmosphere, which is at such times dry and unvarying, to be much more agreeable to the feelings than a less degree of cold, with fluctuating weather, such as characterizes the New England spring.

'The life led by these 'lumber-men' in their 'logging campaign' is described as a very merry and happy one. They enjoy independence of all superior control, and taste the sweets of that kind of liberty which the Desert Arabs love, and the pioneers in the Great West enjoy amid the untrodden prairies, of which they are the first to take possession. Labour is agreeable rather than otherwise; their provisions are abundant, and a bracing atmosphere and vigorous exercise give them a high relish for their food, a zest for their evening's enjoyment, and the best preparation for sound and refreshing sleep. Our companion had been nine months without seeing a house, and he preferred this mode of life so much beyond that of a city, that he always longed to get back to it again. The earnings of the men were equal to about twenty dollars a month, exclusive of their provisions, while employed in cutting, and from two to three dollars per day while 'teaming' and 'floating;' so that, like sailors, after a long voyage, they had generally a handsome sum to receive on concluding their enterprise, and, like sailors also, they usually spent it in a short space of time.'—Ib., pp. 117—119.

Like many other travellers, Mr. Buckingham speaks in high terms of the beauty of American women, or rather girls, as personal attractions seem to fade much earlier with them than with us. Their beauty, however, is wanting in the higher elements of female loveliness. It is, we apprehend, the beauty of a statue rather than of a living form, and consists in regularity of feature and symmetry of parts, more than in a spiritual expression, revealing as by magic an inner and beauteous world. Mr. Buckingham remarks,

'For exquisite loveliness of face, delicate symmetry of features, and innocent softness of expression, there are no cities in the world that possess more perfect models than are to be found in the young females of New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, between the ages of 14 and 18. In general, however, the paleness of their complexion, and the gravity of their deportment, makes them deficient in that glow of health, that lustre of eye, that buoyancy of step, and that cheerful and animated flow of spirits, which distinguish the women of Europe, and give them, both in England and in France, that dominion over man, which in this country they have not yet attained.'—Ib., p. 214.

Some interesting information is furnished respecting the cotton factories of Dover and Lowell, which deserve the grave consideration of our economists. It is obvious that if our present restrictive system be continued, the Americans will be driven to depend on their own manufactories, the consequences of which to our people must be pernicious in the extreme. The injury will, of course, in the first place, fall upon our manufacturers, but it would be the height of folly to suppose that the landed interest can escape. Suffer they must, and are already doing so, but the evil will be beyond remedy if they do not speedily awaken to a larger and more enlightened view of their interests. Amongst the many follies which are cherished in the present day, none is more egregious than that which represents the landed interest as independent of our manufactures,—capable of maintaining its high rents and prodigal expenditure amidst the ruin, or even the decline, of our commerce. America has already been compelled to manufacture for herself, and unless we open our ports to her natural produce, she will speedily become our rival in every quarter of the globe, as she is already in her home markets. As yet, her resources are but partially applied to manufactures, and the tendency of capital to seek this investment may be checked by proffering her a more productive barter trade; but let the proffer be withheld a few years longer, and it will be madness to expect that our artisans should find employment, or our merchants commerce, from the United States. The rapid progress of Lowell, the chief seat of American manufacture, is thus described:—

'Lowell is one of the newest towns in America, and is strikingly characteristic of the rapidity with which settlements are formed, and cities built and peopled, in this rising country. So recently as 1813, the spot where Lowell stands was without a dwelling; but at the close of that year, when the war with Great Britain had cut off the supplies of manufactured goods from England, and when the prices of all such articles were extravagantly high, two individuals, Captains Whiting and Fletcher, conceived the idea of availing themselves of the water-power here given by the Falls of the Concord and Merrimack rivers, to establish on this spot a cotton manufactory. This was erected on a small scale in a wooden building, costing only 3000 dollars. In 1818, this was sold to Mr. Hurd, who added to it a brick factory for the manufacture of woollen goods. But in 1826, he becoming insolvent, his works were purchased by a company, and from that period the works have been so speedily extended, and the population so rapidly increased, by the capital and operations of several other companies entering into the manufacturing enterprise, that there are now ten companies, or corporations, with a capital of about 10,000,000 dollars, occupying or working thirty mills, giving employment to more than 10,000 operatives, of whom 7000 are females, and paying out 150,000 dollars a month in wages, for the manufacture of more than 8,000,000 dollars' worth of goods in the year. Lowell was incorporated as a city, in 1836, and has now a population of about 20,000 persons, with twelve churches, twenty-five schools, four banks, and six newspapers published in the week.'—Ib., pp. 293, 294.

The town is advantageously situated at the confluence of the rivers Concord and Merrimack, and already produces upwards of 52,000,000 yards of cotton cloth, of which 14,000,000 yards are dyed and printed. The condition and habits of the work-people are represented as greatly superior to those of a similar class in Britain, as the following extract will show:—

'All the men that I saw employed in either of these works were better dressed, cleaner, and appeared better fed, healthier, and more contented, than the same class of persons in England; and they have good reason to be so, as they are better paid, earning from six to twelve dollars per week, and some of the more skilful, fifteen dollars—with less cost for living, the enjoyment of all political rights, and the power at any time to emigrate to the West at little charge, whenever their wages should be in danger of being reduced. All the females that we saw, and they exceeded 3000, were still more superior to the same class of persons in England. They were all remarkably clean, well-dressed, and supplied with requisites for warmth and comfort. The windows of the room in which they worked were curtained towards the south, and in every window-seat or sill were seen exotic or native shrubs, plants, and flowers, in neatly-made flower-boxes or baskets, painted green, belonging to these young females, who cultivate them as pets or favourites, in their leisure moments, and watch their growth, their health, and their flowering, with as much interest as any

lady in Christendom. These, too, had the air of being more happy than the factory girls, as a class, in England ; and they have abundant reasons for being so, from the actual superiority of their condition, for they earn more wages, have better food and clothing, work in greater comfort, lay by more money, and rarely enter upon the occupation till fourteen or fifteen, and generally leave it before they are twenty.

'The greater number of the females employed here are daughters of the farmers in the three States of Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Vermont. They do not leave their homes from want, but from a love of independence, and a desire to support themselves by their own labour. They therefore rarely come to the factories till they are fifteen or sixteen, and there is a law prohibiting their being employed before they are fourteen, unless on the condition of their being at school at least three months in the year. When they come, they are in general amply provided with clothes, and every other requisite; and from the first day, they are comfortably accommodated in one of the boarding-houses belonging to the Company in whose factory they may be employed to work. These boarding-houses are neat dwellings, of brick or wood, two and three stories high, built in streets and rows by the respective Companies for their own operatives only. They are let at a rent which yields only five per cent. interest on their cost (though ten per cent. is the lowest profit on their working capital) to matrons chosen by the Company, and under their control, as well as responsible to the directors for the adoption and enforcement of such regulations as they may propose. These matrons are bound to furnish a prescribed number of meals, with regulated quantities and qualities of the articles to the young boarders at fixed rates, so that there shall be no misunderstanding on either side. The number of boarders that may be taken by each matron, who are mostly widows, is also limited; and no other persons than those actually employed in the factory to which the boarding-house belongs, are permitted to be taken in or entertained at the house, nor are any males admitted among the female boarders there.

'Among the regulations by which these establishments are governed, the following deserve mention:—1. Good behaviour in words and actions, and the constant observance of temperance and virtue, are the duties exacted from all, whether in the factory or the boarding-house, as well as diligence and subordination; and any persons violating any of the rules and regulations of either branch are to be punished with instant dismissal. 2. No ardent spirits or intoxicating drinks of any kind are allowed to be used or possessed by any persons of either sex, —agent, overseer, or operative. 3. No games of chance or hazard, such as cards, dice, or backgammon, are at any time allowed. 4. Every person employed must live in one of the boarding-houses, subject to the Company's rules, and all who are not prevented by sickness, must attend divine worship at such church as they prefer, and rigidly respect the sanctity of the Sabbath. 5. The doors of every boarding-house must be closed at ten o'clock at night, and no relaxation of this rule to be admitted on any occasion. 6. A report must be made of the mis-

conduct of any individual guilty of a breach of any of these rules, by the matron of the boarding-house, to the Directors of the Company, through the agent of the factory.

'All things considered, however, Lowell is certainly one of the most remarkable places under the sun; and it is earnestly to be desired that it should for ever continue to retain all its present features of excellence, for I do not believe there is to be found in any part of the globe a town of 20,000 inhabitants, in which there is so much of unoppressive industry, so much competency of means and contentment of condition, so much purity of morals, and gentleness and harmlessness of manners, so little of suffering from excessive labour, intemperance, or ill health, so small an amount of excitement from any cause, so much of order and happiness, so little of misery or crime, as in this manufacturing town of Lowell at the present time.'—Ib., pp. 296—303.

This is unquestionably high testimony, yet other travellers have borne the same, and its substantial accuracy may undoubtedly be relied on.

The superiority of Britain as a manufacturing country is well known to the Americans, and is dreaded by such of them as have embarked their capital in opposition to us. A general outcry is consequently made for protection to native industry, and the example of England 'in excluding all foreign grain for the protection of her agricultural interests is deemed an unanswerable argument in favour of a high tariff.' So short-sighted is human policy when the interests of a class, rather than the well-being of a community, are permitted to control its proceedings. In both countries the same fallacies are propagated to their mutual injury, and statesmen are either too ignorant or too dishonest to rectify the evil. Our agriculturists demand the exclusion of foreign corn for the protection of native industry, and the American cotton-spinner, adopting the same language, and appealing to the same selfishness, asks for a higher tariff in order to keep our goods from competing with himself in the transatlantic market. But our author will best exhibit the American feeling on this subject. He says:—

'In conversation with those interested in the business of manufacturing here, I found a very general impression, that before long, some great change must take place in the tariff of protecting duties, or in the importation of foreign manufactures, or else those of America would have to be given up. The duty on foreign cotton goods was at one time 40 per cent., and with this protection, the factories of this country were enabled to pay good wages to all those whom they employed, and realize a profit of from 15 to 20 per cent. on their capital. But by Mr. Clay's Compromise Bill, the tariff has lessened the amount of the protecting duty every two years; and in the coming year, 1842, it is to come down to its minimum of 20 per cent., and there remain permanent. At this rate, the American manufacturers say it will be

impossible to meet the competition of English goods. Already the importations are so heavy as to fill the warehouses of every city, and leave but little room for the domestic fabrics to find a sale; besides which, here, as everywhere, if a native and a foreign article be of exactly the same price and quality, most purchasers will give a preference to the one that comes from afar off. They add, that when the duty is reduced to 20 per cent., which it will be in 1842, their first step must be to reduce the wages of all their operatives. But they seem to be convinced that they will not be able to get any men to work under the present rates, as they can go to something else; they have some savings to fall back upon, and they can always emigrate to the Far West, so that it will be difficult to get male labourers, and all the operations performed exclusively by them will be necessarily suspended, unless they should be able to get Irish or Scotch emigrants to supply their places. Even the female operatives will also be unwilling to remain at less than their present rate of remuneration, as they have families to return to in the country, or they can seek other pursuits, or marry and go West with their husbands. The only remedy for this state of things appears to be the increase of the tariff or protecting duties on cotton goods, to the old standard of 40 per cent. But there will be some difficulty in this. Most of the Southern members would resist such a proposition, and many of the Western members would join them in so doing; and if they succeed in their resistance, many of the existing establishments of factories will have to be given up, and a large portion of the capital invested in them be lost to their proprietors. But the example of England in continuing her high protecting duties on grain, the chief produce of America, is continually quoted as a reason why equally high protective duties should be imposed on her manufactures. If the corn-laws should be abolished, or greatly modified in England, so as to enable the manufacturers there to produce their goods still more cheaply than at present, the crisis here apprehended would of course be greatly hastened thereby; but of this, it is to be feared, there is little hope, for some time at least.'—Ib., pp. 236—238.

America, like our own country, is unhappily curst with the spirit of party, which rages with terrible fierceness throughout the States, destroying the charities of life, rendering men reckless of character and principles, and sacrificing in a thousand ways the public good. The two great parties are the Whigs and the Democrats, the former of whom must not be confounded with the Whigs of our own country. Mr. Buckingham's account of their principles is as follows:—

'The Whigs, it should be always remembered, comprehend nearly all the wealthy classes in the Union, but especially in the great cities, excepting, of course, the slave-owners and planters of the South, and the office-holders in all the States; as these regard their interests safer in the keeping of Mr. Van Buren than in that of any one who might

succeed him. The Whigs in America are formed of nearly the same classes, and hold nearly the same doctrines as the Conservatives or Tories in England. They advocate a return to 'the good old times;' they dislike innovations; they are dreadfully afraid of increasing the power of the democracy; they would, if they could, most willingly abridge and restrict the right of suffrage, and are for giving to property that increased weight in the scale which they call its 'legitimate influence.' But as the suffrage is universal, and they cannot now make it otherwise, no election can be carried without the aid of that class who compose the numerical majority, and these are the small shopkeepers, small farmers, working artisans and mechanics, and the labouring classes generally. It is found indispensable, therefore, to cultivate their good-will, and obtain their support; and for this purpose every practicable device is used. The name of the party is attempted to be made palatable to this class, by calling it by the strangely-mongrel title of 'Democratic Republican Whigs,' though the Whig and Democrat are the antipodes of each other, and both profess to be equally Republican. In the same spirit of a desire to conciliate the labouring classes, they affect to be wonderfully smitten with the virtue of poverty, in which they resemble the Tories at home, when they form 'Conservative Operative Associations,' mingle with the 'unwashed,' as they once called them in derision, at public dinners, and call themselves the 'Poor Man's Friends.'"—Vol. ii., pp. 114—116.

The political partizanship of America, like that of Britain, is unreflecting, blind, and reckless. It knows no honour, and observes no law. It speaks the language of patriotism, and reasons like a sage, but its heart is devoid of generosity, and its whole aim is the advancement of self. Referring to its prevalence, Mr. Buckingham remarks:—

'I am far from thinking, however, that this is the necessary consequence of a republican form of government, because we have seen equal recklessness and violence in France, Spain, and Portugal, under monarchical power; and in these it vents itself in civil war and massacre in large masses, so that much more blood has been shed in resistance to absolute power than can ever happen in these wars of words between republican malcontents. The evil—for evil it undoubtedly is—of want of confidence in, and respect for, the ruling authorities, so general in America, springs from a combination of causes, which would be likely to produce the same effects under a monarchy as under a republic. Among these causes, the following are perhaps some of the most prominent:—

'1. A relaxation of parental authority, by which young boys are allowed, without check or restraint, to give loose to their unbridled passions before their reason is matured, so that they are without the guidance of rational judgment or parental supervision, and are therefore the sport of every gust of passion.

'2. The too early stage of pecuniary independence at which the

young men arrive, which inflates them with false ideas of their consequence and importance, without their being subjected to the discipline of being obliged to labour mentally, as well as physically, for eminence in station.

'3. The entire absence of all the softening influence of female character on their political views and agitations, women in this country seeming neither to know nor care anything about public affairs, and never being present, to awe or subdue the violence of party feeling into respectful decorum at any of their public meetings.

'4. The too free use of tobacco and spirituous stimulants, which irritate the nervous sensibilities, and make men hot and irascible, who, under a cooler and purer regimen, would be calm and collected.

'5. The impatience to be rich, from a belief that public estimation will be secured by this, the consequent recklessness of speculation, anxieties if successful, and morbid peevishness if unfortunate, all of which impair health, and increase fretfulness of temper.

'6. And lastly, in the Southern States especially, the constant influence of the slave system, which trains the young mind to tyrannize over all who oppose the gratification of its will, and induces it to persecute with unrelenting severity all who successfully resist its encroachments or dictation.

'These appear to me among the most powerful of the causes that operate to produce the political violence so characteristic of American society; and whether it were an hereditary monarch and hereditary nobility that ruled them, or a president and a freely-chosen senate and house of representatives, I do not think there would be much difference in the development of these feelings. As it is, however, the evil is very great, and will require for its cure a much more powerful influence to be exercised by instruction, training, discipline, reason, benevolence, and justice, than there seems any probability of bringing into action for some time to come.'—Ib., pp. 194—196.

To such of our readers as are desirous of accompanying an intelligent, well-informed, and candid traveller, through one of the most beautiful and important sections of the North American States, we strongly recommend these volumes.

Art. III. 1. *An Act for Marriages in England.* (17*th August*, 1836.)

2. *An Act to explain and amend two Acts passed in the last session of parliament for Marriages, and for registering Births, Deaths, and Marriages in England.* (30*th June*, 1837.)

3. *An Act to provide for the solemnization of Marriages in the districts in or near which the parties reside.* (7*th August*, 1840.)

THE 'Act' by which dissenters were allowed to be married in their own chapels, and by their own ministers, constitutes the only special boon which the government of this country has

bestowed upon them since the repeal of the 'Test and Corporation Acts,'—the only measure by which it has attempted to redress their manifold and vexatious 'grievances.' The Act is on that account a rarity; nor is it less curious as a specimen of legislation. Whether it be not a 'grievance' itself may well admit of question, or rather, can admit of no question at all. We will not say that the remedy it offers is worse than the disease which it was designed to cure, for we do not think so; but we will say that it is such a nauseous and ill-concocted compound, containing so many bitter ingredients, and those so little disguised, that we are astonished equally at the effrontery of the doctors who prescribed, and at the endurance of the patients who could swallow it. Whether our legislators in this instance were a sort of homœopathists, and thought that 'grievances,' like diseases, were best relieved by remedies which produce the like symptoms; or that counter-irritants, blisters, scarification, and cataplasms, would best mitigate the internal inflammation, we know not; but certain it is that this 'Act' for our relief inflicts nearly as much wrong as it pretends to redress. It is grossly partial, elaborately confused and complicated, extravagantly expensive in its provisions,—in a word, is framed in such a manner as to neutralize, as far as possible, the very privileges it professes to grant, and to coerce us, under the penalty of unequal charges and unmerited odium, still to repair for matrimony to the altar of the parish church. It was not till lately that we were induced to look with minute care into the provisions and machinery of this curious Act, and we pledge ourselves, before we close the present article, satisfactorily to prove every count in the indictment we have preferred against it. We shall first, however, make a few observations on the causes of the gross faults with which the 'Act' in question is chargeable—of its imperfect and anomalous character.

Far be it from us to lay the sole, or even the chief blame, on the administration who proposed and carried it. It is true that the dissenters, *as such*, are not under any considerable obligations to the late administration; on the contrary, have some solid reasons to complain of neglect and ill usage at their hands. This, however, only formed a part of their general policy of futile conciliation, pursued more systematically, perhaps, with regard to the dissenters' grievances, because they felt, and not altogether without reason, that the dissenters might be safely neglected.

But the chief blame rests with that powerful party who, for a long series of years, either neutralized or vitiated almost every good measure which the ministry proposed. Like the midwives of Egypt, they seem to have been commanded by the Pharaohs of their faction 'to destroy every manchild,' and to keep only the weaker offspring alive; and they discharged their office,

it must be confessed, with more unscrupulous fidelity than did their more conscientious prototypes. Everything that was offensive in the measures brought before them,—that is, whatsoever was chiefly valuable, — was systematically destroyed by amendments, falsely so called; and this emphatically happened with the Marriage Bill. Many of its provisions were undoubtedly most vicious, *ab initio*. But whether these might not be intended as a sop to the Cerberus whom no sops could ever propitiate, and whom yet the ministry were continually but vainly endeavouring to propitiate, we will not determine.

And yet in this unequal and unrighteous piece of legislation (as we pledge ourselves to prove it), our legislators pretended to be redressing our grievances, and vindicating our rights! Such, it appears, is the inveterate jealousy of the powerful party who assert the prerogatives of the church, that their very acts of indulgence are accompanied with insults, and their concessions are but new forms of injury. While redressing our grievances, they manage to multiply them, and rather shift the burden than lift it from our shoulders. No wonder that a shout was raised that dissenters but tardily availed themselves of the benefit of this 'Act.' It is so constructed as to circumscribe its operation within the straitest limits, and to render it as difficult as possible to derive advantage from it. Its framers are like the fox who invited the stork to a dinner, and spread the entertainment in so flat a dish that the long-necked guest could get none of it. They deserve to have their mocking hospitality repaid in the like manner. In good time, says the fable, the stork invited the fox, and took care to place the viands at the bottom of a long-necked bottle. We have no wish, however, to see the injury thus requited. Rather would we long for the day when Ephraim shall no longer envy Judah, and Judah shall no longer vex Ephraim.

But is it not lamentable that the very concessions which are professedly designed to soothe and conciliate, should be poisoned with the manifestations of jealousy? It is said that there is a certain soil in Sicily so intensely bitter, that the very honey which is extracted from the flowers that grow upon it is impregnated with bitterness. We need not stay to make out the application.

That the 'Act' in question, as first passed, was at least exceedingly obscure and defective, is best proved by the tacit admission of the legislature itself, which, in the short space of three years, has passed two other Acts to explain and amend it. The original was entitled, 'An Act for Marriages in England,' and is dated 17th August, 1836. In the very next session was passed another, almost as long, 'to explain and amend both it and the

General Registration Act,' dated 30th June, 1837. On the 7th of August, 1840, was passed another, entitled, 'An Act to provide for the solemnization of Marriages in the districts in or near which the parties reside;' an Act which, as we shall shortly show, needs still another Act to 'explain' its explanations, and to 'amend' its amendments.

None of the amendments in these 'Acts' touched any of the chief objections which we entertain against the original measure. They were merely explanations of its obscure and needlessly complicated provisions, or improvements of some of its technical details. That the 'Act' stood largely in need of such amendments, indeed, is admitted on all hands. More than one superintendent registrar has shaken his head, and shrugged his shoulders, when we have complained of the intricacy of some of its details and the obscurity of others, and has acknowledged that seldom has an Act of Parliament presented in its original form a more hopeful field for quibble, or occasioned more vexation and perplexity in its interpretation.

But no technical amendment whatever could correct the radical vices of such a bill. Of all such attempts at amendment, one might say what the link-boy said to Pope, when the irritable poet had refused the solicited charity with his usual oath, 'Heaven mend me if I do.' 'Mend *you*,' replied the boy; 'it would be ten times easier to make a *new* one.' To mend such a measure as that in question, would be a task as adventurous as that of the audacious quack, who promised a credulous mother the complete cure of her deformed and crippled son. 'But,' said he, 'you must let me *take him to pieces first*.'

We now proceed to state specifically the nature of the objections which we have to the bill as it at present stands. The principal, without pretending to enumerate them all, are as follows:—

I. We object to the demand of three pounds for registering our places of worship. The very permission to solemnize marriage in our chapels, is not so much granted as sold to us, the cost thereof being sixty shillings. Of this tax we should complain under all circumstances, whether equally levied on all classes of religionists or not. But it is *not* equally levied on all classes. Neither Episcopalians, nor Quakers, nor Jews, are subject to it. The Act expressly excludes them; 'they may continue to contract and solemnize marriage according to their previous usages.' A building used by episcopalians, as soon as it is consecrated, immediately comes into possession of its manifold privileges, that of solemnizing marriage amongst the rest. Episcopal consecration, which has often been represented as a very worthless ceremony, is thus proved to be at least worth sixty

shillings, which is perhaps some sixty shillings higher than we should be otherwise disposed to rate it. This exemption of episcopalian places of worship may be thought only a fitting homage to the 'State Church,' though it certainly looks rather odd in an 'Act,' the very design of which is to recognise the equal rights of her Majesty's subjects to be married in the way they think best. But why should Jews' synagogues and Quakers' meetings be exempted? No answer can be returned, except that Jews and Quakers were already in possession of the privileges which we were contented long and patiently to be deprived of. Seldom before have we been so struck with the truth of the old adage, 'that possession is nine points of the law.' It is at the same time a droll reward of our patience in bearing oppression so long. Those who *would* not wait for their privileges, but compelled the legislature to concede them, are formally instated in the possession of those privileges without charge; while those who long petitioned, and petitioned in vain; who waited till it pleased the tardy government to attend to them, are charged three pounds for its own voluntary concession of a natural right! And yet (however disgraceful to the legislature) we have well deserved the treatment we have met with. The Quakers, who insisted on the possession of a right, of which no human government could equitably despoil them, and who said, 'though you should not recognise our marriages, we *will* marry in our own way notwithstanding,' deserved by their courage and consistency the privilege which they have long possessed without purchase, and which it would have been too late to offer to sell them at the rate of three pounds *per congregation*. 'Thank you—for nothing,' would have been the reply; 'we do not wish to buy what is already our own.' On the other hand, we who so long waited till the legislature should spontaneously interpose for our relief, whose timidity and indecision invited wrong as long as it could be inflicted, and partial redress when some redress became necessary, have been justly compelled to buy what never ought for a moment to have been withheld.

There is no argument whatever for the imposition of this tax, except such as would apply equally to Episcopalians, Quakers, and Jews,—that is, none at all; except, indeed, that which has determined the general complexion of the 'Act' all the way through—the wish to render it as burdensome, intricate, and vexatious in its provisions as possible, and thus secure by craft that monopoly of marriage which had before been held by statute.

We shall hereafter show that nothing in the nature of the 'registration' itself could involve more than a few shillings expense. The whole process might have been of the most simple

character, especially in connexion with that general Act for the 'Registration of Births, Marriages, and Deaths,' which was framed and passed the very same session, and of course came into operation at the very same time.

The charge for registering places of worship for the celebration of marriage, was, as the bill was originally framed, fixed at five pounds. This was afterwards reduced to three. Even this will abstract a larger sum from the pockets of dissenters than would at first sight be supposed. The places of dissenting worship to which the provisions of this act extend, are about eight thousand, and upon the supposition that all are registered, between twenty and thirty thousand pounds must be paid for the gracious permission to avail ourselves of a natural right, which Episcopalians, Quakers, and Jews, enjoy without any charge whatever. More than twelve thousand pounds have been already paid.

The injustice of this charge is the more apparent, when we consider,—first, that our places of worship have already paid a heavy duty to government in the shape of the tax on the materials employed in their erection, from which episcopalians are exempted. Secondly, that they have paid another heavy duty when their deeds were enrolled in Chancery.

Its unreasonableness is further apparent when it is considered that the said places have been already duly registered as places of worship; and all that is necessary is a satisfactory certificate at the General Registration Office, that they will also be used for the solemnization of marriages; the expense of which certification, at a moderate charge, might be half-a-crown, or at a very exorbitant one, twice that amount.

But the injustice—the artful injustice of this process of 'registration,' does not end here. Not only must every place of worship now built pay the demand of three pounds—not only must every new place that is built do the same throughout all time,—but if a congregation remove to any *other* building, they must pay over again for the 'substitution' of the new building for the old.'

Nor are our objections to this unjust portion of the bill yet exhausted. Before a chapel can be registered at all, it must have been used as a place of worship for one year, and then two certificates must be forwarded to the registrar, signed 'by *twenty* householders at the least,' to the effect, 'that such building has been used by *them* during, at the least, one year, as their usual place of public religious worship, and that they are desirous that such place should be registered as aforesaid;' each of the certificates being further signed by the proprietor or trustee. The following are the clauses of the 'Act' which provide for this registration; and albeit that 'Acts' of Parliament are not the most entertaining

reading in the world, we request the attention of the reader to every syllable of them:—

'And be it enacted, that any proprietor or trustee of a separate building, certified according to law as a place of religious worship, may apply to the superintendent registrar of the district, in order that such building may be registered for solemnizing marriages therein, and in such case shall deliver to the superintendent registrar a certificate, signed in duplicate by twenty householders at the least, that such building has been used by them during one year at the least as their usual place of public religious worship, and that they are desirous that such place should be registered as aforesaid, each of which certificates shall be countersigned by the proprietor or trustee by whom the same shall be delivered; and the superintendent registrar shall send both certificates to the register general, who shall register such building accordingly in a book to be kept for that purpose at the General Register Office; and the registrar general shall indorse on both certificates the date of the registry, and shall keep one certificate with the other records of the general register office, and shall return the other certificate to the superintendent registrar, who shall keep the same with the other records of his office; and the superintendent registrar shall enter the date of the registry of such building in a book to be furnished to him for that purpose by the registrar general, and shall give a certificate of such registry under his hand, on parchment or vellum, to the proprietor or trustee by whom the certificates are countersigned, and shall give public notice of the registry thereof by advertisement in some newspaper circulating within the county, and in the 'London Gazette;' and for every such entry, certificate, and publication, the superintendent registrar shall receive at the time of the delivery to him of the certificates the sum of three pounds.

'And be it enacted, That if at any time subsequent to the registry of any building for solemnizing marriages therein, it shall be made to appear to the satisfaction of the registrar general that such building has been disused for the public religious worship of the congregation on whose behalf it was registered as aforesaid, the registrar general shall cause the registry thereof to be cancelled; provided that if it shall be proved to the satisfaction of the registrar general that the same congregation use instead thereof some other such building for the purpose of public religious worship, the registrar general may substitute and register such new place of worship instead of the disused building, although such new place of worship may not have been used for that purpose during one year then next preceding; and every application for cancelling the registry of any such building, or for such substitution and registry of a substituted building, shall be made to the registrar general by or through the superintendent registrar of the district; and such cancel or substitution, when made, shall be made known by the registrar general to the superintendent registrar, who shall enter the fact and the date thereof in the book provided for the

registry of such buildings, and shall certify and publish such cancel or substitution and registry in manner herein-before provided in the case of the original registry of the disused building; and for every such substitution the superintendent registrar shall receive, at the time of the delivery of the certificate from the party requiring the substitution, the sum of three pounds; and after such cancel or substitution shall have been made by the registrar general, it shall not be lawful to solemnize any marriage in such disused building, unless the same shall be again registered in the manner herein-before provided.'

From all which it appears that before any marriage can be celebrated in a dissenting chapel, the following things are necessary:—1. The place must have been open for public worship for a twelvemonth. 2. Twenty householders, *at least*, must sign their names to a certificate, to the effect that *they* have used it for their place of worship for that space of time, and that they desire its registration. 3. The said certificate must be signed by the proprietor or trustee. 4. Three pounds must be paid for the registration.

Who can wonder that many small places of worship have never been registered yet, and are never likely to be registered at all? In many of them, as marriages would be solemnized but seldom, it might justly be a question with the congregations, whether they could afford to pay for such a rare luxury. In some cases, it might be difficult to make up the requisite number of twenty *householders*, who could truly say that they had used the chapel as their usual place of worship for a twelvemonth; or where there are but a few exceeding that number, to find twenty who all concur in the propriety of paying three pounds out of their poverty for the privilege. There are very many small congregations in the country that would certainly be in this predicament. The consequence is, that when a marriage is to be solemnized between any two of their members, the parties must either repair to the parish church; or (which would of course generally be impracticable) reside in another district for the time requisite to empower them to be married in it.

If it be said that the marriages in such small congregations cannot be very frequent, and that therefore the injury cannot be very great, we reply first, that the injustice itself is just the same, whether few or many are touched by it; secondly, that it is chiefly the poor, those who cannot help themselves, who are the objects of it; and thirdly, that though the marriages in any one of these very small congregations may be few, yet that as there are some hundreds of such small congregations, the number is altogether very considerable, and the fees thence arising, not altogether unworthy of the rapacious spirit of that church which

never refuses anything it can get, whether it be great tithes or small, munificent grants of public money or the fourpenny Easter offering; which, like another greedy and insatiable visitor—

> 'Pulsat æquo pede
> Pauperum tabernas, regumque turres.'

The tendency, however, of all these vexatious and complicated regulations is unquestionably to circumscribe the operation of the 'Act,' to diminish, either by real difficulties, or difficulties of form, the chance of the dissenters' extensively availing themselves of it. Nor have we the slightest doubt that the conditions of registration have had this effect.

We have said that, in connexion with the 'Act' for the Registration of Births, Marriages, and Deaths, nothing could well be more simple than might have been this portion of the Marriage Act. In order to guard against the alleged danger of clandestine marriages, (for which, however, there are far greater facilities in the establishment than there ever are out of it) the names of some few householders, say of five or ten at most, together with that of the proprietor or trustee, might have been required by the Act previous to registration, and a few shillings, at the utmost, charged for entering the place on the registry and publicly notifying such registration. Nothing, assuredly, ought to have been paid for the civil right itself. If it be said that some expenses must be incurred, we reply, that no purpose but that of extortion can be answered by making them more than a few shillings; and that, at all events, the argument, if worth anything, ought to apply to Jews and Quakers as well as all other classes of religionists. Why are they exempted? If they can do without three pounds' worth of forms, so can we. If we cannot, neither can they.

II. We object to the fee demanded on behalf of the registrar present at the marriage, which is ten shillings when the marriage is by licence, and five shillings when without. It will doubtless be replied, that it cannot be expected that the registrar should attend for nothing. We reply, certainly not; but then who wants him to attend at all? There are ample safeguards for the due performance of the marriage without his presence,—at least, as ample as are those of the church of England. The place must have been duly registered for the celebration of marriage. Notices of the intended marriage from both parties must have been sent in to the superintendents of their respective districts; these certificates are in the superintendent's hands seven days before the marriage can be performed, even by licence, and three weeks if it is to be without; in the latter case, the said notices are read at the weekly meetings of the Board of Guardians. All this (especially if the marriage be by licence, which must be

granted with the usual forms,) one would think quite sufficient to insure security against fraud. Nevertheless, it is precisely in the case of licence that the registrar receives most; his presence at other times is supposed to be worth only five shillings. If you have laid out three pounds on a licence, his value immediately rises one hundred per cent., and he receives ten!

The above precautions might surely be considered sufficient without the superintendent's presence. If not, we again say, they are at all events more than the church has to trust to. Yet the churchman is exempted from all such tax as that of the registrar's fees.* Provided the previous forms of law have been duly attended to in the publication of banns, or the purchase of a licence, as the case may be, the clergyman is thought to be quite competent to attest and certify the marriage. Why the dissenting minister, or the officers of a dissenting church, should be thought not competent to attest the due performance of the marriage, which must be in a registered place of worship after due notice, and by licence or certificate, we cannot divine. A marriage cannot be performed in a place not registered, nor until the proper certificates have been for the due period issued. The provisions of the Act, even without the enforced presence of the superintendent, are of such a nature, and the motives to comply with its provisions so strong, that, it may be safely said, a clandestine marriage would be an event of a very rare occurrence. His presence provides no additional safeguard worth speaking of. It would be the interest of all parties performing the marriage in any licenced building, both for the perpetuation of the privilege, and to escape the serious penalties attached to a violation of the law, to see that the conditions prescribed by the Act had been duly complied with. At all events, the cases, if any there be, of clandestine and illegal marriage, which might arise from dispensing with the presence of the registrar, are no more likely to occur amongst us than amongst Episcopalians, Quakers, and Jews, who are all exempted from the regulation, and would be so extremely rare, that it seems both a most costly and unjust way of preventing it to levy on every dissenter who chooses to marry, a tax of either ten or five shillings!

In addition to all the safeguards provided by the forms preliminary to marriage, we must take into account the penalties

* It may perhaps be said that the clergyman officiating is entitled to some *fee*. We reply, that the fee which can be demanded by *law* is extremely small; and as to gratuities, we should hope, that whatever the dissenter would give to the clergyman, he would give at least as much to his own minister. The *legal* expenses of marriage to the dissenter are, as we shall hereafter have occasion to remark, *about half as much again* as to the churchman.

attached to an infringement of the Act, and we shall then see how superfluously cautious the legislature has been in enforcing the superintendent's presence. The dissenting minister who should 'knowingly and wilfully solemnize a marriage, except in a registered building, or without the notice prescribed by law, without the usual form of certificate or licence, or within the dates prescribed, would still by the Act be guilty of felony.' He is, as it stands, *also* guilty of felony if he shall solemnize a marriage, though all the previous conditions shall have been strictly complied with, without the presence of a registrar. So that if the registrar should happen to have a short memory, or be seized with a fit, or not gifted with punctuality, or misunderstand his instructions, or lose his memorandum of them, or go to the wrong chapel, or do or omit to do any one of the thousand things which might prevent his being at a certain spot at a certain minute, the marriage must be postponed. There is no help for it; though the wedding party and the officiating minister may be all there, they cannot proceed: they are cyphers without the registrar.

It may be said that most of the above contingencies might, peradventure, befall the officiating minister himself. We acknowledge it, and for that very reason cannot think it wise to *double* the risk. It is bad enough that any important act in this uncertain life should be made absolutely dependent on any *one* person. How very desirable is it that it should not be dependent on *two*. Moreover, in case of anything befalling a minister, another could be had. But we cannot go to any registrar. It must be *the* registrar, or none.

It is thought quite safe, nevertheless, to entrust Jews and Quakers with the privilege of celebrating marriages in unregistered places, and *without the presence of a registrar;* the required notice of marriage to a superintendent, and the superintendent's certificate being considered, as they ought to have been in every case, ample security against clandestine marriages. Those who would violate, and could elude these conditions, would not fail to violate the rest, whether they be Episcopalians, Jews, Quakers, Independents, Baptists, or Methodists.

The following is the liberty granted to the Jews and Quakers:—

'And be it enacted, That the Society of Friends commonly called *Quakers*, and also persons professing the Jewish religion, may continue to contract and solemnize marriage according to the usages of the said society and of the said persons respectively; and every such marriage is hereby declared and confirmed good in law, provided that the parties to such marriage be both of the said society, or both persons professing the Jewish religion respectively, provided also, that notice to the registrar shall have been given, and the registrar's certificate shall have issued in manner hereinafter provided.'

The enforced presence of the registrar is further shown to be unnecessary, (except for the purpose of increasing expense and vexation,) inasmuch as though he is present, the law demands the very same attestations of the actual performance of the ceremony as would be amply sufficient without it. The marriage must be attested by the signatures of the officiating minister, of the parties married, and of two witnesses. The only thing is, that we are supposed to be incompetent honestly to transmit such a document to the registrar for entry in his book.

But whether the presence of the registrar be designed for the greater security against clandestine marriages or not (and we think we have proved that there are ample securities without it), the argument is irresistible, that it is a security which Episcopalians, Quakers, and Jews, are not obliged to offer. No reasonable man will pretend that there is greater danger of clandestine marriages amongst Independents, Baptists, or Methodists, than amongst Episcopalians, Quakers, and Jews. The regulation in question, therefore, can never cease to be looked upon as a deliberate and humiliating stigma upon us.

We know of nothing more mean in the whole annals of unequal legislation, than the distinctions made in some parts of this 'Act.' Thus the certificates of the superintendent or superintendents, granting leave of marriage, are to be delivered, if the marriage be in the church of England, to the clergyman; if amongst the Quakers, to anybody they may appoint; if among the Jews, to the officer of the synagogue; but amongst dissenters, no officiating minister is to be entrusted with the precious document; it must be delivered to the registrar.

Again, in the statement of the penalties attached to the violation of any of the provisions of the 'Act,' who but must feel indignant at the invidious exceptions? That is felony in an Independent, which is no crime at all in a Quaker or a Jew.

'And be it enacted, That every person who after the said first day of *March* shall knowingly and wilfully solemnize any marriage in *England*, except by special licence, in any other place than a church or chapel in which marriages may be solemnized according to the rites of the church of *England*, or than the registered building or office specified in the notice and certificate as aforesaid, *shall be guilty of felony* (*except, in the case of a marriage between two of the Society of Friends commonly called Quakers, according to the usages of the said society, or between two persons professing the Jewish religion, according to the usages of the Jews*); and every person who in any such registered building or office shall knowingly and wilfully solemnize any marriage in the absence of a registrar of the district in which such registered building or office is situated shall be guilty of felony; and every person who shall knowingly and wilfully solemnize any marriage in *England* after the said first day of *March* (except by licence) within twenty-

one days after the entry of the notice to the superintendent registrar as aforesaid, or if the marriage is by licence within seven days after such entry, or after three calendar months after such entry, shall be guilty of felony.'

As to the argument, that Quakers and Jews were already in possession of certain privileges, and it would have been unwise to dispossess them, the answer is obvious. If it be safe and proper that they should be entrusted with such privileges, other religious bodies may be entrusted too. If the regulations in question were thought only an adequate security, then they should have been applied, with impartial justice, to the whole nation. The obnoxious provisions of which we complain, are either necessary for the protection of the community or not; if necessary, none should have been exempt from them; if unnecessary, on none ought they to have been imposed.

We must avow our belief that the attendance of the registrar, unequally and partially as it is enforced, was designed for no other purpose than that of increasing the expense, and rendering the operation of the Act more complicated and difficult. By such means it was hoped that dissenters might be deterred from extensively availing themselves of the privilege of marriage by their own ministers, and that the church might still enjoy the greater portion of the marriage fees. This we firmly believe to have been at the bottom of it.

III. We object to the limited benefit accruing to the dissenting purchaser of a licence, as compared with that conferred by such an instrument on the members of the established church. Church people must either have the banns published for three successive Sabbaths, or purchase a licence, in which latter case the whole nuisance of banns is got rid of, and the parties may be married immediately. Instead of banns, dissenters must submit to having the notice of marriage read 'three successive times, in three successive weeks, at the weekly meeting of the Board of Guardians.' This is to supply the place of the publicity of banns. But if a licence be purchased, the parties do not escape, as in the church, the whole of this edifying and interesting exhibition. The period within which the marriage must not be solemnized, is abridged from twenty-one to seven days; that is, after seven days, the superintendent may issue his certificate. But during those seven a weekly meeting of the guardians must take place, and the notice of marriage, *may, according to the Act*, be read *once*, notwithstanding the licence; and if read there once, it might as well be read half a dozen times. We believe, however, that, in point of fact, the notice of marriage, if to be by licence, is often not so read at all. This, however, is a courtesy in those

who are entrusted with the administration of the law, and is not provided for by the Act itself. If we might speculate on the causes of this connivance, we should say, that it was felt there might be some danger lest 'licences' should be found of no value whatever; or of so little, as to render them no longer a saleable commodity. As the Act is constituted, they are so worthless, that we do trust that dissenters will forego the use of them, and thus compel an alteration of the law. Churchmen certainly get, if not a penny-worth for their penny, some considerable compensation. Dissenters, if the superintendents happen to deem it necessary to act upon the letter of the law, do not get anything. The three pounds may just as well be thrown into the dirt.

The granting of a licence to a member of the church of England is the simplest thing in the world. All he has to do, is to go at once to the surrogate, make oath that the parties designing marriage have lived fifteen days in the place wherein the church in which they wish to be married is situate, and immediately, without description of persons, without any publicity whatever, the parties may proceed to be married. Dissenters, on the other hand, cannot get the licence at all till seven days after they have given the superintendents of the district in which they dwell the ordinary notice of marriage, containing full particulars of age, profession, place of abode, &c. Talk about fraud! There never was a system which afforded so many facilities for clandestine marriages as that of the church of England. Nor do we wish that there should be so little security amongst dissenters—what we complain of is the unequal legislation. The notice of marriage, if compulsory in any case, should be rendered compulsory in all, previous to granting licences. But it will be seen, that though we do not object to the notice of marriage, previous to granting a licence, we do object to that mean and artful arrangement by which an interval of *seven* days is demanded before the licence can be issued, thereby insuring, so far as the 'Act' is concerned, one of those exhibitions before the Board of Guardians, to avoid which is the very object of purchasing the licence. Since the avoiding of publicity is the motive for purchasing a licence, (whether within the church or not) why not put us, in *this* respect, on a level, and while demanding, and very properly demanding, in all cases, the notice of marriage, with description of persons, &c., empower the superintendent to issue his licence within four or six days?

IV. The last thing we think it worth while to notice in the present 'Act' is, the unequal conditions it imposes respecting the *place* in which marriage is to be celebrated. The regulations on this subject are contained in the last of the three 'Acts' mentioned at the head of this article. After stating, in the preamble,

'that whereas it is expedient to restrain marriages under the late Act from being solemnized out of the district in which one of the parties dwells, unless either of the parties dwells in a district within which there is not any registered building wherein marriage is solemnized according to the form, rite, or ceremony the parties see fit to adopt,' it is therefore declared and enacted, 'that it shall not be lawful for any superintendent registrar to sign any certificate of notice of marriage when the building in which the marriage is to be solemnized shall not be within the district wherein one of the parties shall have dwelt for the time required by the late Act,' except where one of the parties makes a long declaration, that there is, in the district in which the marriage is to be solemnized, no place of worship registered in which the ceremony can be performed, according to the form preferred by the party. As a consequence, it often happens that persons cannot be married in the chapel they ordinarily attend, because, though they may be within half a mile of it, such chapels are not in the district in which the party dwells, or in the nearest district to it. Now Quakers and Jews are thus coolly exempted from all observance of this statute.

'*Provided always, and be it enacted, That, notwithstanding anything herein or in the said recited Acts or either of them contained, the Society of Friends commonly called Quakers, and also persons professing the Jewish religion, may lawfully continue to contract and solemnize marriage according to the usages of the said society and of the said persons respectively, after notice for that purpose duly given, and certificate or certificates duly issued, pursuant to the provision of the said recited Act of His late Majesty, notwithstanding the building or place wherein such marriage may be contracted or solemnized be not situate within the district or either of the districts* (*as the case may be*) *in which the parties shall respectively dwell.*'

Again we say, either the vexatious regulations of this Act are necessary for the community at large, or not; if necessary, it is a flagrant impropriety that any should be exempted from them; if unnecessary, that any should be subjected to them. For our own parts, we believe that the notice of marriage, the required certificate or licence, and the properly attested declaration to the superintendents, of the solemnization of the marriage within the period specified by law, would be a sufficient security, and that with such securities the parties might be left, like the Jews and Quakers, to be married in any district they thought proper. It *must* be in some registered building, and all the superintendents having printed lists of the registered chapels, might easily, by reference, see that this condition too had been duly complied with. As it is, the jealousy of allowing a man to marry out of

his own district often gives rise, as we can bear witness, to considerable inconvenience.*

But the best test of the inequitable legislation which distinguishes this 'Act' is found in the difference of expense to which the churchman and dissenter are severally subjected in every individual case of marriage. The dissenter who marries by licence, must pay altogether FIVE AND TWENTY SHILLINGS more than the churchman who marries by licence! The whole legal expense of the churchman is about THREE POUNDS; that of the dissenter, FOUR POUNDS FIVE. We have not, of course, taken into account the gratuities bestowed, on these occasions, to the officiating ministers on either side, for they do not affect the calculation. As we have already said, whatever in the shape of present or gratuity the dissenter would have given to the clergyman of the parish church, he would feel equally disposed to give to his own minister. We are speaking of the money which *must* be paid; and we repeat that the dissenter who is married by licence, has to pay five and twenty shillings more than the churchman who is married by licence. As to the poor man, who cannot afford to buy a licence, the difference is not so great in

* So peculiar is the wording of this little 'amended Act,' that many readers, and even some superintendents have, upon a first perusal, supposed that, before the required indulgence can be conceded, the parties must declare that there is not, in the district of *either*, any registered place in which marriage can be solemnized according to the form or rite they most prefer; and that if there be no such place in the district of the bride, for example, while yet there is one in that of the bridegroom, (although he may live three hundred miles off,) thither must the lady repair rather than go half a mile to the next district. This, however, we hold not to be the right interpretation of the Act. 1. From the phrases, 'unless *either* of the parties dwells in a district,' &c., 'that there is not within the district in which *one* of the parties dwells, &c., any registered building,' &c. 2. From the absurdity of supposing the contrary. For if we suppose both parties required to make the declaration, each for his or her own district, before the benefit of the Act can be claimed, then, if James Crow, belonging to the sect of Jumpers, and living just on this side the Tweed, be engaged to Mary Lightfoot, of the same sect, living near the Land's End, and there be no registered chapel belonging to the Jumpers in Mary's district, though there may be one in the district adjoining, yet she cannot be married there unless there be also no registered building in James' district; if there be, contrary to all principles of common sense, and all feelings of decorum, Mary must travel five hundred miles to be married in her lover's district. This consequence we say is so absurd, that it is impossible to believe it to be the meaning of the 'Act.' 3. We argue the same from the acknowledged permission which the law gives to the parties, of being married in either district, when both do not dwell in the same. If then, having decided upon one or the other, there be no registered place in that district, in which the parties can be married according to that 'form, rite, or ceremony,' they approve, it seems to be the object of the present Act to allow them the privilege of being married in the next adjoining district in which there is such a chapel. As the declaration,

amount, but still there is a difference, and, in *proportion,* a still greater. The five shillings he has to pay for the enforced presence of the 'registrar,' increase the expense of marriage to him more than *fifty per cent.* Shall these distinctions, at once so needless and so humiliating, be allowed to remain any longer? We have no more to say on this point, than that if dissenters submit to them, they deserve to submit to them. Their stupid patience invites oppression, and they may depend upon it that the invitation will be accepted.

Such is this singular attempt at the redress of our grievances! Dissenters must purchase the privilege of marriage by paying for the registration of the chapels in which it is solemnized; they must pay, in every individual case of marriage, beyond all comparison, more than the favoured churchman; many of the provisions of the 'Act' are needlessly minute and complicated; many humiliating and invidious. If it be asked, How is it that in a matter so simple, and which admitted of such a plain and easy remedy—even the remedy which, by this very 'Act,' is extended to the Jews and Quakers—such pains should have been

however, required of the parties seeking the benefit of this 'Act' is a curiosity in its way, and may seem to admit of different interpretations, where all should have been as plain as a pikestaff, we subjoin it for the reader's edification, leaving him to digest and expound it to the best of his ability. If *all* the bracketed clauses are to be filled up, the Act simply requires an impossibility, for it clearly implies that if there be no registered place in either district, though these districts may be five hundred miles asunder, that the district having such registered place which is nearest to the one will be always nearest to the other. This alone would establish the interpretation of the law for which we have pleaded.

'I, the undersigned and within-named *James Smith,* do hereby declare, that I, being [*here insert, a member of the church of England, a Roman-catholic, Independent, Baptist, Presbyterian, Unitarian, or such other description of the religion of the party*], and the within-named *Martha Green,* in solemnizing our intended marriage, desire to adopt the form, rite, or ceremony of the [*Roman-catholic church, Independents, Baptist, Presbyterians, Unitarians or other description of the form, rite, or ceremony the parties state it to be their desire to adopt*]; and that to the best of my knowledge and belief there is not within the superintendent registrar's district in which [*I dwell*], *or* [*in which the said Martha Green dwells*], any registered building in which marriage is solemnized according to such form, rite, or ceremony; and that the nearest district to [*my dwelling place*], *or to* [*the dwelling place of the said Martha Green*], in which a building is registered wherein marriage may be solemnized according to such form, rite, or ceremony, is the [*here insert the name by which the superintendent registrar's district is designated*]; and that we intend to solemnize our marriage in the registered building within that district known by the name of [*here insert the name by which the building has been registered*]. Witness my hand this *Tenth* day of *August One thousand eight hundred and forty.*

(Signed) *James Smith.*

[The *Italics* in this Schedule to be filled as the case may be.]

taken to render of little value the professed instrument of our relief, the only answer that can be returned is the one we have already so often given; that it was the very object of the church party to retain, as long as they could, and as far as they could, a monopoly which at once gratified their love of power and their love of money,—which was profitable to them and humiliating to us. They wished, if something must be done, to do as little as they could; and while professing to relieve us, sought to neutralize the very remedy itself. They knew that in proportion as they could render the Act troublesome, vexatious, and expensive, in that proportion would they limit and circumscribe its operation; in that proportion would they still retain the marriage office, and better still the marriage fees, in their own hands.

In this we acknowledge they have been tolerably successful. For though we have often blamed dissenters for the limited extent to which they have availed themselves of the present 'Act,' we must confess that after a diligent inspection of it, we think great excuses are to be made for them. We know there are ministers who are so disgusted with its partiality and injustice, that they have declared they will never sanction it by registering their chapels for the solemnization of marriage. In this we think them wrong; and yet we can hardly wonder at their conduct. Three things we consider incumbent on the dissenters in this matter. First, to avail themselves of the Act, such as it is, till they can get its obnoxious provisions repealed or modified. This we think they should do on many grounds. The 'Act' does at least secure us the privilege of being married by our own ministers, and at our own chapels, and thus far deprives the church of her monopoly, even although it makes us pay unjustly for it. Consistency also seems to demand that we should avail ourselves of it. To do the contrary, is to do the very thing which the church hopes we may do, and to which we doubt not, it was its very object to drive us, by this grossly partial and unjust legislation. Secondly, we think dissenters should defeat the extortionate spirit of the 'Act' by refusing to purchase the 'licence.' By the Act, that licence grants nothing more than the privilege of having the names of the parties to be married read only once instead of thrice, before the Board of Guardians; and, as we have already remarked, if read once, they might as well be read half a dozen times. If anything more be granted, it is owing to the courteous or interested connivance of particular superintendents. The law itself gives little more than allowing your certificate of marriage to be printed in *red* ink instead of *black*. If there are any persons who think this worth three pounds, who have a particular love for very expensive, and at the same time very insipid luxu-

ries, they belong to a class with whom it is in vain to argue. We shall merely remark farther on this head, that if dissenters were generally to avail themselves of the 'Act,' and at the same time disappoint its spirit of extortion, by refusing to purchase the worthless licence, the Act would soon be altered. Our enemies would give up, rather than that the trade in licences should cease. Thirdly, we think that dissenters should immediately petition for an alteration of the 'Act.' And their demands should at least extend to the following points:—They should demand that their chapels should be registered for nothing, or for the few shillings which will really cover all expense that may be incurred. They should demand that licences should secure us, if not all that they give the churchman, yet a complete exemption from all liability to have the notice read before the Board of Guardians. They should demand that the registrar's presence, and the registrar's fee, should be both dispensed with. And they should demand also, that parties should be married in any district that may be most convenient to them; provided they give the required notice of marriage, obtain the required certificate, or licence, as the case may be, be married in some registered place of worship, and transmit the proper attestations of the marriage to the same superintendent who has issued the certificate or licence. This would be ample security against fraud. Further restrictions are needless, oppressive in their character, and are not demanded of all. Now we say, let all be exempted or none.

We are glad to see that the first recommendation dissenters are already beginning consistently to act upon. They are beginning to see the absurdity of professing themselves dissenters, while they yet repair to the altar of the parish church. It is high time. Much as we condemn the injustice of the Act which we have been criticising, we cannot but be sensible that there are many inconsistent dissenters, who would not pretend that their inconsistency in being married at church was the result of such injustice, or would assign that as the cause of it. There will always be, in all communities, timid creatures, who dare not act without precedent; who must see others, and others for whom they have respect, taking the lead; who are strictly gregarious, and would be hardly got to go to heaven itself, if they were compelled to travel there alone. There are others who fear to encounter a little odium; others, in whose bosoms, though they would be ashamed to own so childish a prejudice, there are the remains of a lurking superstition in favour of the church on this particular point. With some, still more unworthy of the name of rational beings, it is simply made a question of *associations*. They recollect that their grandfathers and great grandmothers were married at church—they think of the picturesque old country

church, and the merry bells, and the wedding procession all in the sunshine, and the ring, and the garlands of flowers, and the old customs. They call to mind pretty passages of poetry, and 'Ah!' they are ready to sigh, 'we have no such associations with the chapel ceremony!' To all which we beg to say, that associations, however attractive, however poetical, ought not to regulate our practical conduct in any important matter. There are many conscientious dissenters (we are ourselves of the number) who are enchanted with the music of the church bells, associated as they are with images of rural beauty and sabbath quietude, and with some of the most beautiful and touching passages in our poetical literature; but they are not led, perforce, as by some blind, irrational instinct, to forsake the place of worship and the religious service to which their better convictions lead them. And secondly, we may observe, for the comfort of these sensitive and imaginative creatures, that similar associations — not perhaps *quite* so picturesque, because they must want that element of interest, antiquity—will be sure to spring up in connexion with the wedding day, wherever and with whatever rites the marriage ceremony may be performed. None, we presume, will need to ask why; or if there are any such, all we can say is, that this is not the place to read a lecture on the philosophy of our associations. Suffice it, that they all borrow beauty, or the reverse, their bright or their sombre hue, from our happiness or our misery.

The repugnance which many of the weak or inconsistent felt to avail themselves of the new Marriage Act, was still further strengthened by the infamous arts to which our adversaries were not ashamed to resort. Not contented with having robbed us of our rights so long; not contented with insulting us by grossly partial legislation in the very Act by which they professed to restore them, they resorted, in many cases, to the most heartless and cruel calumnies, because we contended that, however right and fit it was that marriage, like every other important transaction in life, should be hallowed by 'the word of God and prayer,' it was in itself a civil contract, and nothing more; because we would not abuse common sense or common language, by making it, with these superstitious men, a sacrament or a something, nobody knows what, between a sacrament and no sacrament. They did not scruple to hold up dissenting marriages as little better than a sort of licensed concubinage—as unions from which 'God was excluded'—as 'atheistical,' and we know not what. All which, being interpreted, meant just this—'we are mad that you have escaped from under our petty tyranny, and that we can no longer pocket your fees—if we cannot oppress you, we will still endeavour to intimidate you; and, if you will not be intimidated, you

shall, at all events, be insulted.' It is in no other way that we can interpret the disgusting ribaldry in which our enemies indulged, for we cannot imagine them to have been idiots enough to believe all the nonsense they uttered. We rejoice to believe that their violence and insolence were, on the whole, useful to us. If they frightened some few timid persons amongst us, they disclosed to the eyes of the majority the true spirit and the real motives by which they were animated.

Art. IV. *Edwin the Fair. An Historical Drama.* By Henry Taylor, Author of 'Philip Van Artevelde.' London: Murray. 1842.

Eight years ago, the Author of 'Philip Van Artevelde' stepped forth from 'the sage seclusion, the retreat sacred to letters,' 'unhappily unfrequent in the land,' to take at once his place, no mean one, among the dramatic poets of our country. He stood forward boldly as a reformer of poetical taste, avowing himself a disciple of the elder masters of the drama, and bearing testimony against the Byronian poetry and the 'phantastic school' of Shelley and his followers. His success justified the loftiness of his aim and the freedom of his criticism. The execution of the poem was as skilful as the conception was vigorous. 'Philip Van Artevelde' is 'no shadowy personification, but an historic person, an individualized combination of the real elements of human nature, exhibited in action and progress;'*—'a character of mixed and earthly elements, acting upon events and circumstances which re-act upon the agent, modifying, darkening, tarnishing the intellectual and moral nature, and leaving, at last, the man how altered from his youth!' A new work, therefore, from the same pen, while it challenges public attention on the ground of the Author's deserved reputation, will not be judged of from its intrinsic merit, but by comparison with his former production. The Author must pay the penalty of his success, if this comparison should lead to a somewhat unjust disparagement of a work which, had it been the production of an unknown or inferior author, would have won commendation, and been hailed as the promise of better things. We regret to say, that 'Edwin the Fair' cannot compete with 'Philip Van Artevelde.' As an historical portrait, or rather, as a dramatic conception, the unfortunate Saxon King is very inferior to the Flemish Regent. The plot, which breaks off abruptly, is less interesting, as well as less skilfully managed; scenes and personages being introduced

* Eclectic Review. Vol. XII. (3rd Series.) pp. 251, 264.

which, if not out of keeping with the main story, have but a secondary connexion with the course of events. And this is the case, notwithstanding that the Author has 'not scrupled to borrow from the bordering reigns incidents which were characteristic of the times, and acts which, though really performed by some of the *dramatis personæ*, were not performed by them during that portion of their lives which is included in the reign of Edwin.'

The object of the poem is to delineate the struggle of the monastic orders, 'in the ascetic and fanatical stage of their existence,' to grasp supreme power, in opposition alike to the temporal magnates and the secular clergy. The Romish and monachal interest was headed and supported by Dunstan, the far-famed Abbot of Glastonbury, whose odour of sanctity, and fearful combats with the evil one, formed so favourite a theme with the monkish writers. In his character, which is the leading one of the drama, there is an obscurity which Mr. Taylor has not succeeded in clearing up. The Anglo-Saxon saint must have been either a zealous and thorough fanatic, self-deceived, and therefore deceiving the world, or a specious, designing hypocrite, who would have deemed it a superfluous trouble to try to persuade himself that his tortuous course and ambitious aims had for their object to eject Satan with discomfiture from his moral empire in the heart of man. Dunstan could not have been an incongruous mixture of these two opposite characters, as we find him here represented. His soliloquy in Scene 3, is that of a mistaken, but fervent zealot. He then suspends his devout aspirations to establish his creature Gurmo, a thorough-paced villain, in the hollow of a tree, where he is wont to bellow, in the character of Satan, to support the demon-quelling reputation of the saintly hermit. This incongruity excepted, the character of Dunstan is well conceived. His interview with the queen mother, which immediately follows the scene above alluded to, exhibits the wily hypocrite to the life; and as, towards the close of the drama, his power becomes more firmly established, he breaks forth into a display of arrogance and violence of temper worthy of the cowl. The other ecclesiastical characters are natural and well drawn. The conversation of the monks in the corridor of a monastery at Sheen, is a quiet satire upon the idleness of conventual life and the abject servility of the holy monks. The primate, Odo, jealous of his own dignity, yet forced to yield to the mightier spirit of the self-denying abbot, the politic Cumba, 'so wild and sweet,' who

> 'Betwixt the monks and secular church half-way
> Stands smiling upon both;'—

the rabid Morcar and his fiendish brother, Monn, are sketched in our Author's happiest style. As to the unfortunate Edwin, he is represented as possessing 'the spirit of a king, and of a king of England too' (to apply the words of our great Princess); and had he been such as Mr. Taylor has portrayed him, he might have defied monk, abbot, and primate, and have swayed the sceptre of Alfred in spite of the crosier. The light-hearted but faithful and gallant Earl Athulf is own brother to our earlier acquaintance, Sir Walter D'Arlon; and his engagement to the king's sister reminds us of the suit of Clara Van Artevelde, who is not very unlike the royal Saxon maiden. Wulfstan the Wise is a more original character, and admirably sustained; a Saxon Nestor, whose *copia verborum* is redolent of practical wisdom, though at times, as is natural, bordering on the garrulous. Emma, his daughter, spirited and fearless, is a pleasing character; although we cannot admire her feint of being married to a poor simple youth, with a view to secure to herself an equivocal protection in her mission. But the strongest interest is inspired by the noble Leolf, who had been promised the hand of the heroine, Elgiva, by her brother, and finds himself supplanted by a younger and royal lover; yet, instead of reproaching, he thus extenuates her fault:—

LEOLF.

'Reproach her not; she is a child in years,
And though in wit a woman, yet her heart,
Untempered by the discipline of pain,
Is fancy-led. One half the fault was mine.
She is a child; and, look—upon my head
Already peepeth out the willowy grey.
My youth is wearing from me.

ATHULF.

Nay, not so.

LEOLF.

And youth and sovereignty, with furtherance fair
Of a seductive beauty in the boy,
What could they but prevail!
* * * * *
Quit we the theme.
But from my griefs and me this counsel take:
Expend the passion of thy heart in youth;
Fight thy love-battles whilst thy heart is strong,
And wounds heal kindlily. An April frost
Is sharp, but kills not: sad October's storm
Strikes when the juices and the vital sap
Are ebbing from the leaf. No more!'—pp. 52—54.

We must add the soliloquy of the gallant '*heretoch*,' or com-

mander, when he seeks, in his ancestral towers, the 'companionable music of the sea.'

'*The Sea-shore, near Hastings.*

LEOLF, *alone.*

LEOLF.

'Rocks that beheld my boyhood! Perilous shelf
That nursed my infant courage! Once again
I stand before you—not, as in other days,
In your gray faces smiling, but, like you,
The worse for weather. Here again I stand,
Again and on the solitary shore
Old ocean plays as on an instrument,
Making that ancient music, when not known?
That ancient music only not so old
As He who parted ocean from dry land
And saw that it was good. Upon my ear,
As in the season of susceptive youth,
The mellow murmur falls; but finds the sense
Dulled by distemper; shall I say—by time?
Enough in action has my life been spent
Through the past decade, to rebate the edge
Of early sensibility. The sun
Rides high, and on the thoroughfares of life
I find myself a man in middle age,
Busy and hard to please. The sun shall soon
Dip westerly; but oh! how little like
Are life's two twilights! Would the last were first
And the first last! that so we might be soothed
Upon the thoroughfares of busy life
Beneath the noonday sun, with hope of joy
Fresh as the morn,—with hope of breaking lights,
Illuminated mists and spangled lawns
And woodland orisons and unfolding flowers,
As things in expectation.'—pp. 73, 74.

Elgiva, the lovely and unhappy victim of monkish machinations, the reader will feel unable to blame, or to suspect of having trifled with the heart of her early suitor. We must let her speak for herself in the following beautiful scene:—

EDWIN.

'We are alone, Elgiva;
Oh, how I hate my title in your mouth.
Rather than speak as in the audience-chamber,
Let us be children once again, to rove
O'er hill, through vale, with interlacing arms,
And thrid the thickets where wild roses grow
Entangled with each other like ourselves.

Can you, and will you, those sweet days remember,
And strive to bring them back?

ELGIVA.

Those days—Oh, Edwin! . . .
Can I remember? When can I forget them?
When flowers forget to blow and birds to sing,
And clouds to kindle in the May-day dawn,
And every spring-tide sight and sound shall cease,
Or cease for me, then too for me shall cease
The sweet remembrance of the tender joys,
The smiles, the tears of those delightful days.

EDWIN.

And can they not repeat themselves? Again
Let us, though grown, be children in our hearts.
Then with the freedom and the innocence
Which led our childish steps we'll wander on
Through after life, but with a fuller joy.
Let recollections of the past, if sweet,
Plead sweetly for the present.

ELGIVA.

Edwin, Edwin!
You are a king.

EDWIN.

Now, see! I've summoned up,
Like a magician whose strong spell evokes
A beautiful spirit, the spirit of the past,
And bid it speak, and prophesy, and plead;
And, lo! it nothing answers but the words
The Herald spake, when o'er my father's grave
He brake his wand of office. I am a King,
But may not Kings be happy? May Kings not love?

* * * * *

Beloved Elgiva,
Thy beauty o'er the earth a passion breathes
Which softly sweeping through me, brings one tone
From all this plural being, as the wind
From yonder sycamore, whose thousand leaves,
With lavish play to one soft music moved,
Tremble and sigh together.

ELGIVA.

What a charm
The neighbouring grove to this lone chamber lends!
I've loved it from my childhood. How long since
Is it that standing in this compass'd window
The blackbird sang us forth; from yonder bough
That hides the arbour, loud and full at first
Warbling his invitations, then with pause

And fraction, fitfully as evening fell,
The while the rooks, a spotty multitude,
Far distant crept across the amber sky.
But hark! what strain is this? No blackbird's song,
Nor sighing of the sycamore!

EDWIN.

Some friend,
As if the key-note of our hearts divining,
Accordant music ministers. Hist! Hist!'—pp. 33—37.

These extracts will, we hope, sufficiently answer the purpose of shewing that the poetry of this drama is of a high order. We owe an apology to Mr. Taylor for having so long delayed this brief notice of his volume, but he must attribute it to our reluctance to speak with modified praise of a work which, as coming from his pen, we opened with, perhaps, too highly raised expectations, hoping to have renewed the powerful interest created by his Philip Van Artevelde and Adriana. The pleasing impressions left by his former work, if not reproduced, have not been displaced.

Art. V. *Apostolical Christianity; or, the People's Antidote against Romanism and Puseyism.* By the Rev. James Godkin, author of a 'Guide from the Church of Rome to the Church of Christ.' 8vo. London. John Snow, Paternoster-row.

To every attentive observer of the 'Signs of the Times,' it is obvious that Romanism has, of late, acquired great apparent vigour, and that the partisans of Romanism are bestirring themselves with unwonted activity and zeal for the support and propagation of their principles. They do not consider it sufficient to stand on the defensive, and labour to repel attacks made on their system by the friends of truth; but, as if feeling that now or never is the time to rouse to effort for the safety of their church and the spread of their sentiments, and that merely standing on the defensive will avail little, they have become actively aggressive, and are ready to compass both sea and land, and employ all means, foul and fair, to make proselytes to their sect. Nor need we be surprised at this recent renewal of zeal in the bosom of the Romish church. The progress of society, and the spirit of the age, are opposed to everything intolerant, and which rests merely on authority. Liberty, civil and religious, is the darling theme of men of all classes and all creeds. The spirit of inquiry is abroad. All systems, however venerable, whether they be systems of politics or religion, are about to be subjected, and indeed, are now in the act of being subjected to a process of

sifting investigation. It will not avail the abettors of these systems to urge authority, or to plead prescription. In vain do they vociferate 'Hear the church.' Argument, or at least, the semblance of argument, must be produced to satisfy the cravings of awakening mind--Rome knows this, Rome feels this; and, therefore, she is up and full of energy. Could inquiry be quashed, could the progress of enlightenment be stayed, could the yoke of authority be imposed on Christendom, or could the power of the sword, or the terror of the fire and the rack, be exerted with unrestrained freedom—then indeed, Rome might sit secure, and scorn to reason with those she could so easily crush. But as she can hope for no such things, as the course of society, enlightenment, inquiry, freedom, is onward, her only policy is to adapt herself to the circumstances in which she is placed, and, by appearing as the friend of inquiry, and by employing argument, aim to support her interests and extend her sway. Rome too, is conscious that in periods gone by, she has *lost*, and is now anxious to retrieve her loss; nor should we be surprised if, in some cases, she obtains success. To us it appears quite natural. Nor are we alarmed—Why should we? The struggle is between truth and error; and if, in this struggle, error should sometimes obtain an advantage, yet we know that truth *must* and *will* eventually prevail.

And of what, after all, has Rome to boast? In France the principles of the Reformation are gaining ground. A wide door of usefulness is open there to evangelical labourers. In Spain, the political power of the Pope has been disclaimed, monasteries have been destroyed, and the priests are held in little respect; while, as a missionary from Spain informs us, the *people* seem generally disposed to listen to the preaching of the gospel. In Italy itself, the authority of the Pope is so little regarded that Mennais, in his 'Affaires de Rome,' avers,—and Mennais is a Roman-catholic writer,—'Rome knows it, the pontifical authority has, for a long time, had nowhere less influence than in Italy. . . . Not only do they, (the Italians,) not believe in it, but they repel it with a lively animosity; they hate it with an implacable hatred, as the principal cause of the evils of the country. It is distressing to speak thus; but in the state of things one ought not to conceal any truth. Let Italy then, be, for one single day, left to herself; let the existing order have no other support than the admonitions of the head of the church, his prohibitions and his commandments, the next day the revolution would extend from Turin to the extremity of Calabria.'

In England, it is true, in protestant England, Rome is meeting with some success. Here she has been able to make proselytes to her creed from among the upper, middle, and lower classes of

society. This, we should think, is mainly attributable to the previously existing Anglo-Romanism of the Anglo-catholic church. Under the influence of this, we might expect to see many, already disposed towards Romanism, becoming, when the path of consistency is shown them, full-grown Romanists. The Puseyite movement is the joy of the Romish church; without this, Rome would have but little footing in England; and hence, the hope of Romanism in Britain, lies within the bosom of the Anglican church.

On Ireland, Romanism has, no doubt, a firm hold. The Irish are, truly, a religious people; infidelity has, at least among the humbler classes, no influence upon them; they would avoid an infidel as they would a fiend, but to their church they are firmly attached. Protestantism has made very little impression upon them; they regard the efforts of protestant ministers with suspicion; they give *such* but little credit for sincerity in their professions of love for the souls of Irishmen; their own church they consider as a poor and persecuted church, while they regard protestantism as a persecutor. And who, that reads the history of Ireland, however grieved he may be, can be astonished at this? They have generally seen professing, but misnamed protestantism, going hand in hand with oppression, spoliation, and misrule. The church of England was established among them by force, and has always appeared in their midst, instead of a herald of peace and a dispenser of blessings, as a collector of taxes, an oppressor of conscience, and an author of discord. With this church the Irishman usually connects, in his thoughts, the injustice of the tythe proctor, the bayonet of the policeman, and the poverty, tears, and even blood, of his kinsfolk and acquaintance. The cruel persecutions which Ireland has suffered from the avowed abettors of protestantism, the penal laws which have pressed, like some mighty incubus, on the energies of the country, and the degraded position the Irish Romanist has been compelled to take,—all these things have only tended to steel the hearts of Irish Romanists against the truth, as dispensed by protestants, and to attach them with a fonder and stronger affection to their church. Just as the storm, which overthrows stronger obstacles to its progress, and lays them prostrate on the earth, only causes the trembling ivy to entwine itself round the oak with a firmer grasp.

Another circumstance which has tended materially to retard the spread of protestantism in Ireland, is the *unkind spirit* which protestant controversialists have too generally displayed towards Roman catholics. Instead of assuming the tones of conciliation, and treating deeply fixed and easily roused prejudices with that tenderness which a sound knowledge of human nature, or even

of their own hearts, would have dictated, they have, too commonly, indulged in bitter declamation, unkind invective, and unsparing abuse. They have acted so contrary to what they should, that if they had been hired by Rome for the purpose, they could scarcely have more effectually opposed the progress of truth. Add to this, that they have been the avowed, or at least well known, enemies of the political rights of the Irish Romanist. And this holds true, with some honourable exceptions, of dissenters as well as of the adherents of the established church; hence, as might have been anticipated, the success of such, otherwise accomplished advocates of the truth, has proved miserably small.

It is but just, however, to observe, that a change for the better has come over Ireland—old prejudices are giving way, a spirit of inquiry is pervading the masses of the people, education and illumination are making progress, and the yoke of priestly domination and tyranny is gradually, but certainly, falling from the neck of the once thoroughly priest-ridden Romanist. If asked the cause of this pleasing change, we would reply, it is the result, in part, of political and religious agitation, leading the people to *think*, on all subjects, for themselves; in part, of the bold and noble assertion of the principles of civil and religious liberty, constantly made from the platform and the press by Roman-catholic agitators: in part, of the establishment of schools in numerous districts of the country, where none existed before; in part, of the increasing intercourse between Roman-catholics and protestants, joined with the fact that greater numbers of the latter than could be counted in former times, have, in these latter years, avowed themselves as the advocates of the political rights of the Irish Romanist; and, finally, in part, from the recent remarkable and unprecedented spread of temperance among the working classes. The Irish priest, though sincerely loved, has not the same despotic authority over the mind of his flock which he could once exert; and this, we believe is, in a great measure, to be attributed to Roman-catholic priests and agitators themselves. The people, appealed to, on all political subjects, are beginning to be *conscious* that they have minds, and to feel that they have a *right* to exercise their minds on every subject; and having been once brought to this state, they are not likely again, quietly, to submit to any over despotic exercise of spiritual authority. Let then the Roman-catholics of Ireland be approached in the spirit of wisdom, and dealt with in the spirit of love, and who can say what may be the happy result? It is pleasing to add, that there are men prepared so to act towards them; men whose spirit is mild, whose manner is full of candour and honesty, and whose political views are avowedly liberal. Among these Mr. Godkin, whose book stands at the head of this

article, holds the foremost place. Many pious persons in Ireland, who have been altogether opposed to controversial lectures against Romanism, because of the unchristian spirit which too often pervades them, have, on hearing Mr. Godkin, been obliged to acknowledge, (contrary to their previous convictions,) that controversy 'may be conducted in a Christian manner,' without acrimony and abuse. We hail, therefore, the appearance of another work from the pen of Mr. Godkin, on the Romish controversy—a subject on which he is so competent to write. To use his own words:—'He is no raw recruit in this warfare. He was brought up in camps, and has been for several years engaged in active service. He has tried his weapons, and found them proof in every species of conflict, whether wielded from the press, the pulpit, or the platform.' The truth of this we can attest from our own knowledge. Having been brought up a Roman-catholic, and being withal a man of deep thought and acute observation, he is well acquainted with the 'inner form' and essence, as well as with the outward bearings of the system whose unsoundness he has discovered, and which truth, long since, obliged him to forsake.

His acquaintance with Romanism qualifies him, of course, equally well, for writing against Puseyism, which we are compelled to regard, not as a different system from Romanism, but as, in all its leading features, essentially the same. If Romanism be the opposite to Protestantism, and if the great principles of the latter be the sole and supreme authority of the written, inspired word, in all questions of faith, discipline, and morals,—and the right of every man to exercise his mind in judging of the meaning of the Spirit in the revelation he has given us, uncontrolled by human dictation,—then, surely, Puseyism is radically and essentially Romanism. It may differ in some things from Popery, it may be free from the grosser elements and more obnoxious external forms of the papal system, it may even have been in existence, in some of its principles, before the Romish system was fully matured; but that is false delicacy only, and not simple justice, which would keep us from averring that it is essentially the same. While, therefore, it is convenient for the sake of explicitness and for argumentative purposes, to distinguish the systems by different names, we must never forget, that they are of kindred origin and nature. Let popery be destroyed, and Puseyism will perish along with it; or, let Puseyism be overthrown, and popery is no more.

Mr. Godkin's book is an admirable 'antidote' against both these systems; and is peculiarly fitted to be the '*people's* antidote,' not indeed, because it is not learned and fundamental, for this is by no means the case; but because it is written in a style

so simple and lucid, that it is comprehensible by all. There is much learning in it, or rather, we should say, there are the *results* of much learning and research, admirably condensed and popularised. It goes thoroughly into each question it discusses, and brings to bear upon all a large amount of powerful argumentation; producing, in most cases, full satisfaction in the mind of the reader. If the stream of argument and illustration throughout runs clearly, this is not because it is shallow, but because it is beautifully transparent. The style of the work is simple and chaste, perfectly free from affectation, false ornament, and turgid declamation, which passes with some for eloquence. Here and there will be found passages of surpassing beauty. On the whole, we have seen no work, amid the many which have issued from the press on the same controversy, better, and few so well calculated, to vindicate protestant truth, and to expose and refute Italian and Anglican popery.

The book is divided into twenty-three chapters, with the following titles:—'Introduction,' 'The Chair of Peter,' 'Rise of the Papal Supremacy,' 'Reign of the Papacy,' 'Apostolical Succession,' 'The People's right to choose their own Pastors,' 'Scriptural Bishops and Catholic Prelates,' 'On Hearing the Church,' 'General Councils,' 'The Keys and the Confessional,' 'The Predicted Apostasy,' 'Celibacy and Monachism,' 'Claims of the Ancient Fathers,' 'Sketch of the History of the Church,' 'Baptismal Regeneration,' 'The Real Presence and Transubstantiation,' 'The Mass, or Eucharistic Sacrifice,' 'Mediation of Christ, and Invocation of Saints,' 'State of the Dead,' 'Purgatory,' 'The Use of Images in Worship,' 'The Christian Sabbath,' 'Infant Baptism and the Procession of the Holy Ghost,' 'Faith and Works,' 'Conclusion.' It will be seen from this enumeration, that the work is very comprehensive. Instead, however, of advising Mr. Godkin to diminish aught from his book, our advice would be to add a few chapters more on the sole authority of the Bible, tradition, and the right of private judgment. We would also suggest a different arrangement of the work. Let the introduction stand by itself unnumbered; let the predicted apostasy and the following two chapters form the first three; let the second to the tenth chapters, inclusive, come next; then the fifteenth to the twentieth; then the twenty-second; then the twenty-first; then the fourteenth; and then the twenty-third, forming the conclusion. Such an altered arrangement would, we conceive, be an improvement to the book.

If we were disposed to find fault with any chapter, it would be with that on 'Baptismal Regeneration;' not that Mr. Godkin is not orthodox on the point, but because the subject does

not appear to be discussed with his usual ability; still we admit it is excellent. In page 265, our author speaks *as if* baptism and regeneration were sometimes 'confounded' together in Scripture, as are the 'sign and the thing signified' in common speech; but surely this is not so. The term regeneration is never applied to water-baptism—water-baptism is never called regeneration. We read of the 'washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost,' but it is manifest that the 'washing of regeneration' denotes the *commencement* of the great moral change which is carried forward by the 'renewing of the Holy Ghost.'

In page 267 we read, 'It is true, Paul was called on at his conversion to 'arise and wash away his sins,' but that was plainly in an emblematical and ceremonial sense,' &c. Here Mr. Godkin obviously takes the command, 'wash away thy sins,' to refer to baptism, and therefore he takes it in an emblematical sense. But such is not the meaning of Ananias. 'Arise and wash away thy sins;' but how? namely, by 'calling on the name of the Lord.' See Rom. x. 13.

While pointing out these (as we conceive) errors, we shall take occasion to refer to a few more. In page 25, our author says, 'the highest power of the keys is that of forgiving or retaining sin.' We think not. The two things are, in our view, totally distinct. The one is authority to open the kingdom of heaven; the other,—namely, the power of remitting and retaining sin, is authority to declare infallibly and by inspiration, the terms of forgiveness and the grounds of condemnation. We cannot admit, with *Lightfoot*, that the latter has reference to the infliction of diseases on offenders, and the removal of such diseases in case of repentance.

On the same page the writer asserts that the power of the keys was conferred on *all* the apostles. We ask, when and where? We are of opinion that this promise, 'I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven,' was made exclusively to Peter, and was actually fulfilled in his ministry; for he it was whom God employed to open the door of the kingdom to both Jews and Gentiles,—to the former on the day of Pentecost, to the latter when he was called to visit Cornelius. Once opened, we may observe, it needed not to be opened again.* On page 95, Mr. Godkin expresses his uncertainty as to whether the apostles had the sanction of their Master in the election of Mathias. We know it is very common to say they had not: but we demand why? Had they not received the Holy Spirit? John xx. 22. But on this point we have not room to dwell.

In page 126, Mr. Godkin falls into a curious misquotation.

* See Lightfoot.

'The righteous man falleth seven times *a day*.' Prov. xxiv. 16. 'A day' is an addition which we have frequently met with in theological writings, but for which we are altogether unable to account, as it is found neither in the authorized version, the Douay, the Latin Vulgate, the Septuagint, nor the Hebrew.

In page 372, our author says, 'Pliny testifies that the Christians met to worship Christ as God on the *first* day of the week. This is an error. Pliny's words are '*stato die*.' True, the *stated* day was the first of the week.

We marked down these and a few other trifling errors, not for the sake of finding fault, but to point them out for correction. They are so trifling, that we were disposed to pass them by without noticing them, but this would not be just to the author. We shall now furnish our readers with a brief extract or two, remarking, that no extract can give an adequate idea of the work, and that we hope all our readers will possess themselves of it as a volume which will largely contribute to their gratification and instruction in the truth. The following extracts are from the chapter on 'Apostolical Succession':—

'If Rome possessed apostolic power at the Reformation, as the Anglicans contend, and if all bishops derived their authority from the pope as the vicar of Jesus Christ, how could a small minority of those bishops, living in England, revolt against their head without being guilty of *schism* and spiritual rebellion?

'If they were guilty of that crime, have they not been ever since, not only '*abandoned*' by their mother, but shut out of the pale of the Catholic church, whose unity they had wickedly broken?

'Was it not *in obedience* to Henry VIII., a licentious, secular tyrant, that the English church renounced the authority of her Roman mother? and is it not a fact that she was a tool of the civil power; that the number of these priests who kept a conscience in the reigns of Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth, never amounted to two hundred? All the rest tamely conformed, the colour of their creed changing as fast as the chameleon's, according to the light that shone upon it from the court. They did not refuse to bow down to the ever-changing idols, which the temporal sovereign chanced to set up.

'But what becomes of all the wonderful virtue which, as we have seen, high-churchmen ascribe to the succession, if the very power to whom it was committed by apostolic hands, and by whom it is transmitted to others, could, after all, '*set up idols*,' and such idols as even the Anglican hierarchy had too much conscience to worship? How comes it to pass that the most apostolic church in Christendom is also the *most idolatrous?*

'Contrary to the nature of all holy things, this mystical power seems to be moved by a strong propensity to ally itself with corruption. It delights to brood, like the sea-bird, on agitated waters, that cast up weeds and mire; and, as if endowed with a charmed life, it survives

in a perpetual pestilence where every other heavenly grace is sure to perish! Forsaking the bright abodes of the virtuous and the free, it selects as its chosen, its eternal home, the darkest city, the vilest court, the bloodiest throne in Europe.'—pp. 60, 61.

Again:—

'Indeed it is utterly impossible that the apostles could have *successors*. With nearly as much reason might you say, that our blessed Saviour had successors in the work of redemption. The apostles did a work which *could not be repeated*. They *revealed* the gospel—that cannot be done again. They opened the 'door of faith to the Gentiles'—that requires no second hand to touch it; it stands open for ever. They laid the foundation of the church—that foundation can never be moved. There cannot be a succession of founders any more than a succession of inventors—'other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid' by the 'wise master builders.' The Romans and Anglicans have indeed laid another, but *theirs* does not support the church of Christ, it only supports their own, a building I would not like to live in, when the storm comes and the floods rise.'—p. 66.

The whole chapter on the Succession is admirable. If space permitted, we would present our readers with some passages from that headed, 'A Sketch of the Church of Christ;' but we strongly recommend it to their attentive perusal, as giving a beautifully scriptural view of the true church. It is admirably written.

The following passage will give the reader an idea of Mr. Godkin's style; it is on the Lord's supper:—

'The loveliness of pure and undefiled religion 'needs not the foreign aid of ornament.' Of all the forms of Christianity, none is so sublimely simple, or fraught with such interesting associations, as the Lord's Supper. In the night in which he was betrayed, JESUS, surrounded by his disciples in a private room, took bread and broke it, also wine, and poured it out, and having given thanks to his Father, gave them to his disciples, saying, 'DO THIS IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME.' This was his memorial. Here he erected a monument to perpetuate his name. There was no sounding of trumpets, no military rejoicings on this occasion, no master of eloquence pronounced an oration, no poet recited his ode of immortal praise, no royal declaration sanctioned the birth of this holy institute, nor did the great and noble congregate to witness its establishment. To the philosopher, the poet, the historian, the statesman, nothing could appear more mean and insignificant than this last supper. If they deigned to consider it for a moment, they would regard it merely as the unmeaning act of a few illiterate enthusiasts—a mere bubble on the mighty stream of national events. Could they have dreamed that it was the emblem of a power which should *revolutionize* the world!—that after the lapse of nearly two thousand years of changes and of national disasters,—of falling empires and rising commonwealths,—of wars, convulsions, and

desolations,—of revolutions in science, in literature, in religion, in national manners, in commerce, in all sorts of opinions,—THIS ORDINANCE should be found existing still in primitive purity and simplicity, diffused over the earth from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, flourishing even in a world unknown to ancient Rome, still fresh in its beauty, undimmed in its lustre, unmaimed in its power, borne on the billows of every sea, penetrating the gloom of every wilderness, and finding a lodgement in the heart of every savage tribe. Nor is it wrapt in the clouds of tradition, of uncertain origin, and doubtful aim. Children need not ask their parents, 'What mean ye by this?' It is surrounded by the light of authentic history; and, like a luminous cross in the firmament, proclaims to all nations, and all ages, that JESUS DIED to REDEEM the world, and will come again to be its JUDGE. The memories of those who built the Pyramids are perished; cities bearing imperial names are buried in ruins: monuments of brass and marble have yielded to the 'cankering tooth of time,' and been faithless to their trust. 'Decay's effacing fingers' have obliterated the features of ancient greatness from the worn-out canvass; but this representative memorial still lives to tell its thrilling story of love, and power, and peace. What name so well known as the name of JESUS! 'His name shall endure for ever; His name shall be continued as long as the sun, and men shall be blessed in Him: all nations shall call Him blessed' and blessed be His glorious name for ever! and let the whole earth be filled with his glory. Amen and Amen.'—pp. 315, 316.

The whole chapter, of which this beautiful paragraph forms the close, contains the most eloquent argument we have ever read against the sacrifice of the Mass. We recommend it to our readers' special attention, along with that on transubstantiation.

Mr. Godkin, in treating of transubstantiation, denies that the words, 'this is my body,' even if taken *literally*, can denote 'a change of the bread into the substance of our Saviour's body.' The verb *to be*, he maintains, never signifies a change. When a change is to be expressed, another word is always employed. When one thing is said to be *another*, the language is *always figurative*. These positions, within which Mr. Godkin entrenches himself, form a bulwark of strength from which the enemies of the truth will, in vain, endeavour to dislodge him.

But while we are fully satisfied with the completeness and conclusiveness of the argument, we are not sure but that Mr. Godkin has fallen into an error. The verb *to be*, he says, never denotes a change. When this idea is to be conveyed, another word is always employed. To prove this, he adduces various examples. Among these is the transubstantiation of Moses' rod into a serpent, where the Hebrew *substantive verb* הָיָה is employed. Now הָיָה corresponds with the English verb

to be, and is commonly used as a copula to connect the subject with the predicate, as in the examples: 'the serpent *was* more subtle than any beast of the field,' 'Abraham *was* ninety years old and nine,' 'the earth *was* without form and void.' It is true that the Hebrew has another verb, which signifies *to be;* we mean יֵשׁ; but this is frequently used as a substitute for הָיָה; and the force of both, we think, is the same. Both denote *existence*. Now in asserting that the verb *to be* never denotes a change, and yet adducing הָיָה as denoting a change, Mr. Godkin *appears* to contradict himself. We are of opinion that הָיָה, *by itself*, is never used to signify the change of one thing into another. We know Gesenius assigns to it as one of its meanings, *to become*, but let his examples be rigidly examined, and we are bold to affirm that none of them will be found to bear out his position; or even should the Hebrew word have this meaning, in some places, in none will it be found to signify, *by itself*, the change of one thing into another. The only example* we know of in which the word *seems* to denote such a change, is in the 19th of Genesis, in relation to Lot's wife. But there is no transubstantiation here. The language is figurative—just as figurative as the words, 'that rock was Christ'—'she was, or existed, a pillar of salt'—an *everlasting monument* of the sin of disobedience. (See Numbers, xviii. 19; 2 Chron. xiii. 5; Amer. Bib. Repos. Vol. iii., N.S., p. 344; A. Clark's Commentary.) When the idea of change is intended to be conveyed, the construction is the substantive verb הָיָה, followed by the preposition לְ. 'This,' says Professor Stuart (Heb. Gram. p. 204, ed. 5), 'is the habitual construction' in such a case. Thus God breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life, וַיְהִי לְנֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה, 'and he became a living soul.' So in the case of Moses, he cast his rod upon the ground, וַיְהִי לְנָחָשׁ, 'and it became a serpent.' (Gen. ii. 7; Exodus, iv.)

While, therefore, we differ a little with Mr. Godkin in the mode of arriving at the conclusion, that the verb *to be* never denotes a change: in the conclusion itself we fully acquiesce, as well as in the necessary consequence, that the words, 'this is my body,' even should they be taken *literally*, *do not*, and *can not* convey the idea of a transubstantiation.

* There is another apparent example; but we conceive it is only apparent. Exod. vii. 19. The Lord said to Moses, 'Take thy rod, and stretch out thy hand over the waters of Egypt,' &c., וְיִהְיוּ דָם, and there shall be, or that there may be, blood. True, the verb is plural; but the noun, though singular in form, is a collective, and may have a verb singular or plural in concord with it. The Septuagint rendering is *καὶ ἔσται αἷμα*, which is more correct than the authorized version.

But we must hasten to a close. We have read the book with great satisfaction. It is a valuable accession to our stores of polemical theology, as well for the mildness and tone of spirituality which pervade it, as for the clearness and power of its reasoning. It deserves a high place among our standard works on controversial divinity. The 'Guide' is a deservedly popular work, but *this* is of a very superior order. We hope, therefore, indeed we are sure, that it will have an extensive and rapid sale, and that speedily we shall have to record the appearance of a second and enlarged edition.

Art. VI. *A Popular History of British India, Commercial Intercourse with China, and the Insular Possessions of England in the Eastern Seas.* By W. Cooke Taylor, LL.D., &c. London: Madden and Co.

This is a very seasonable, useful, and judiciously executed publication. At the very moment when the interest attaching to British India—owing to various circumstances, but more particularly to the Affghan and Chinese wars, in which this country has been so lately and fearfully engaged—was perhaps never more profoundly felt; every person, and more especially every young person, partaking of this natural feeling, will hail with thankfulness and delight, such a convenient manual of its history as the present, brought down, moreover, to a very recent date, namely, the middle of the year 1842. And the more valuable we regard it in many respects, inasmuch as it is a simple narrative of facts, derived for the most part, as the author tells us, from the best authorities, in which he introduces few or no opinions of his own, but leaves his readers to form their own reflections and deduce their own conclusions. We are also informed that it is intended, in the successive editions of the work, to bring down the history of our Indian empire to the latest period. Of course a succinct account of the recent proceedings in Affghanistan finds a fitting place in this volume, extended to the forcing of the Khyber Pass by General Pollock, the landing of Lord Ellenborough at Calcutta, and the death of Shah Sooja. Subjoined is a narrative of British intercourse with China, and of our late conquests and proceedings in that country down to the capture of Ningpo and of Chapoo on the 18th of May, 1842.

Possessing, as we do, the very profound, philosophical, and voluminous work of the late Mr. Mill, recently so ably edited by Professor Wilson, of Oxford, and already in part, the somewhat more popularly written, and we believe correct and faithful, though still extensive and discursive, history of India by Mr.

Elphinstone, there would yet seem to be room for a more concise, popular, and matter-of-fact account of our Eastern territories than any hitherto extant, and the present volume is well calculated to fill up the void. The task of its compilation required a discriminating judgment, a niceness in the selection and classification of facts, and peculiar powers of condensation in the narration, all which qualifications Dr. Taylor evidently possesses. For this purpose there was no occasion for the author to have previously resided in India; though some persons are of opinion, (an absurd one we think,) that no one can adequately describe the annals of that country, without an intimate personal acquaintance with it, as well as a knowledge of the Oriental languages. Whether Dr. Taylor is possessed of either or both of these accidental qualifications we are not aware, but we venture to maintain there is no real necessity that he should be. Mr. Mill had never been in India, and yet he produced an original history, which, for general utility, fidelity, and philosophic acumen, has never been surpassed. Much less necessary is it, then, we should apprehend, that the writer of a work such as the one now before us, should be in the enjoyment of this doubtful advantage. Robertson was never in America, though he composed its history; nor in Germany or Spain, though he wrote the history of Charles the Fifth; nay, it is said that he did not even know the German language. Tacitus was never in Germany, nor acquainted with the language of the Teutonic race, and yet he wrote a treatise on the manners of the Germans, a composition generally admired for the fidelity and exactness with which it is executed, though some have declared that he delineated manners and customs which never existed. Many other instances of the like kind, both from ancient and modern times, might be adduced if it were requisite. 'I have no doubt of being able to make out, to the satisfaction of all reflecting minds,' says Mr. Mill, 'that the man who should bring to the composition of a history of India, the qualifications alone which can be acquired in Europe, would come, in an almost infinite degree, better fitted for the task, than the man who should bring to it the qualifications alone which can be acquired in India; and that the business of acquiring the one set of qualifications is almost wholly incompatible with that of acquiring the other. For, let us inquire what it is that a man can learn, by going to India, and understanding its languages. He can treasure up the facts which are presented to his senses; he can learn the facts which are recorded in such native books as have not been translated; and he can ascertain facts by conversation with the natives, which have never yet been committed to writing. This he can do; and I am not aware that he can do anything further.' He

goes on at considerable length to prove, and we think very successfully so, that the man best qualified for dealing with evidence, is the man best qualified for writing (and may we not say epitomising?) the history of India; that the habits which are subservient to the successful exploration of evidence are more likely to be acquired in Europe than in India; and that the mental habits which are acquired in mere observing, and in the acquisition of languages, are almost as different as any mental habits can be, from the powers of combination, discrimination, classification, philosophising in short, which are the powers of most importance for extracting the precious ore from a great mine of historical materials.

If these remarks should appear to the reader a digression, having little, or but a doubtful, relevancy to the subject in hand, or admittedly, (from our previous observations) to the compiler of the work before us, our apology is, the desire of an opportunity, however incidental, to meet the somewhat prevailing opinion relative to this topic, and which has exhibited itself more prominently than ever, since the publication of the first part of Mr. Elphinstone's history, (though we hint no disparagement to that able work,) and to put our own sentiments on record; at the same time we cannot but express our perfect acquiescence in the frank admission of Mr. Mill, that, 'as some knowledge may be acquired by seeing India, which cannot be acquired without it; and, as it can be pronounced of hardly any portion of knowledge that it is altogether useless, we will not go so far as to deny, that a man would possess advantages, who, to all the qualifications for writing a history of India which it is possible to acquire in Europe, should add those qualifications which can be acquired only by seeing the country and conversing with its people.'

From the earliest times, India has been regarded as one of the countries most highly favoured, both by nature and art; and, though but imperfectly known to the Greeks and other western nations, they imported some of its choicest and costliest productions, such as its silks, diamonds, and aromatics. In the middle ages, the ports of Egypt and the Red Sea served to facilitate an extensive intercourse with India, which the merchants of Europe, and more particularly of Venice, found themselves called upon and were anxious to maintain; and the precious products thus imported from it into the western regions confirmed the popular opinion of its high refinement and its vast wealth. The discovery by Vasco di Gama, of a passage to India by the Cape of Good Hope, tended still further to strengthen these ideas; and the fleets and armies of the maritime states of Europe were soon enlisted in the grand contest for procuring to their respective nations the dominion of the Asiatic seas, and the commerce of

the country. The Portuguese and the Dutch were the first successful competitors for these beneficial objects. Subsequently, the English and the French obtained a secure footing in India, and established factories on its coasts for the reception and the warehousing of merchandise. By degrees these were converted into military posts, and, in process of time, those two European powers became rivals in the struggle for the more exclusive advantages of the commerce and conquest of the country. The contest eventually terminated in the triumph of the arms of Great Britain, who extended her power on every side, and gradually rose to greatness and dominion, while France lost her pre-eminence on the continent of India. By this vast enlargement of the British power in the East, the way into the interior has been opened, and its territories more deeply and intimately explored. Our knowledge of this distant region has become, in consequence, greatly augmented; and if more accurate inquiry has brought us nearer to the truth with respect to its physical character and resources, and put aside the marvellous stories of the glory and greatness of India—the seat of industry, of commerce and the arts during the era of European barbarism, the theatre of many eventful revolutions, anterior to its conquest by Britain, and the abode of a people of singular manners, institutions, religion, and laws—it yet presents, notwithstanding the effects which British intercourse and influence have wrought upon it, a wide and fruitful field for interesting inquiry and speculation; nay, these very effects are become an attractive theme of further investigation.

Dr. Taylor commences his volume with the early history of Hindustan, and in this we think he departs 'somewhat from his text,' for it must be recollected that his is professedly a history of *British* India, and not of India in general. The same may be said of the four succeeding chapters, which treat of the Affghan and Mongolian conquests of India, the Empire of Delhi, Early Intercourse between Europe and India, and Sketch of the History of the Portuguese Empire in India. It is not till we arrive at the sixth chapter that we find any mention of the intercourse between Great Britain and India, which expressly treats on the commencement of that intercourse. Here, then, we take it, is the point where his history ought, *consistently*, to have opened, and the date at which Mr. Mill's account does begin.* Few

* It is true that in his second book, Mr. Mill treats of the chronology and ancient history of the Hindus, the classification and distribution of the people, the form of government, the laws, religion, etc.; but we think the discussion of these matters might have been spared, without any detriment, in a work designed as a popular compendium of the history of *British* India.

nations, as Dr. Taylor justly remarks, are more deficient in authentic records of their antiquity than the Hindûs; instead of histories, they possess only vague traditions, exaggerated by the imagination of their poets, and monumental remains which, while they attest by their stupendous size, the taste and magnificence of their founders, afford no certain information as to the time when their builders existed. The principal native authorities for the early annals of Hindustan, are the eighteen Puranas, and the two great epic poems called the Ramayana and Mahabharat. But these are of traditionary origin, and of a fabulous character. Some histories of Kashmir, written in the eleventh and twelfth centuries of our era, throw some light on the antiquities of India; and more accurate information respecting the state of the country during a few centuries preceding the Christian era, may be obtained from the Greek writers, as Herodotus, Strabo, Arrian, and others, most of whom obtained some knowledge of these distant regions in consequence of the conquests of Alexander.

We must pass over the more uninteresting and less relevant portions of the volume, and proceed to where we think the work itself ought to have commenced, namely, at the sixth chapter. The opening of this part will give the reader some idea of the style and spirit which distinguish the writer throughout.

'Soon after the termination of the wars of the Roses, and the restoration of national tranquillity under the Tudors, the English people began to manifest the spirit of maritime discovery, commercial enterprise, and adventurous colonization, which they had inherited from their Saxon ancestors. This spirit had long been suppressed by the Norman aristocracy, alien to England in lineage, language, and feeling; but in the sanguinary struggle between the rival divisions of the Plantagenet family, the Norman nobles had wasted their resources, thinned their ranks, and lost their exclusive possession of political power. Families of Saxon descent began to be raised to the peerage; the forfeiture of monastic lands enabled Henry VIII. to endow the new nobility with estates, and other branches of the same families, emulous of their greatness, sought a road to fame and fortune in the paths which the discoveries of Columbus and Gama had opened to boldness and enterprise. Among all the navigators and adventurers who suddenly appeared under the Tudors, there was scarcely one who could claim affinity with the old Norman nobility; nearly all of them belonged to the class of country gentlemen, the descendants of the Saxon franklins, men who preferred the paths of honourable industry to the gilded profligacy which had usurped the name of chivalry.

'Previous to the accession of Elizabeth, this country was supplied with Indian commodities from Venice, by an annual ship of great value, and as the Venetians could then charge what price they pleased, the commerce was anything but lucrative to England. The shipwreck of a rich Venetian carrack, on the Isle of Wight, excited the English

merchants and mariners to attempt obtaining a share of the lucrative commerce of the East. Sir William Monson, who witnessed the loss of the vessel, appears to have taken an active part in urging the people of London to attempt to rival the Venetians, and he found the citizens very ready to second his attempts. 'They devised,' he says, 'how such commodities may come into our hands by a more direct way, than to be served, as we were, at second-hand; and therefore resolved to make an overture, by favour of the Queen and her letters, to the Great Turk, for an immediate traffic from England to Turkey, and his dominions, and so thence again, with ships of her own subjects, without being beholden to them (the Venetians). These letters were sent by her Majesty, and received with great humanity and courtesy by the Grand Seignor, as appears by his letters yet extant. In conclusion, the articles were agreed upon, and a grant of great privileges and immunities to her Majesty's subjects, which have since continued and been peaceably enjoyed. Thus the first trade between England and India was opened through the Levant, and the Turkey merchants were regarded as the true East India traders.'*

In 1576, some London merchants, on the suggestion of one Thorne, who had long resided at Seville, and acquired an extensive knowledge of the East Indian trade, believing that it would be possible to discover a new passage by the north-east or north-west to the Indian seas, and thus avoid the tedious navigation round the Capes Horn or Good Hope, fitted out two ships under Captain Forbisher, who made three attempts to effect this passage, but without success. Sir Francis Drake, on returning from his voyage round the world, declared that the route which Thorne had suggested was impracticable, and this opinion has hitherto proved to be well founded. Several other voyagers from England about this time reached India by various routes; but none of them were considered safe or eligible until the celebrated Cavendish opened a certain passage to the East in his voyage round the world, A.D. 1587. He sailed from England in 1586, with three small ships, equipped at his own expense. His course was through the straits of Magellan, and having crossed the

* It appears from Hackbuyt, that there was a very considerable trade to the Levant in English bottoms, between the years 1512 and 1534. He tells us that several stout ships from London, Southampton, and Bristol, had a constant trade to Candia, China, Cyprus, and Beiroot in Syria. Our imports were silks, camlets, rhubarb, malmsies, muscadels, and other wines; sweet oil, cotton goods, carpets, gall, cinnamon, and other spices. Our exports were, fine and coarse kerseys, white western dogans, cloths called statutes, and others called cardinal whites, skins, and leather. From a contemporary document it appears that in this early day, Manchester had already acquired some fame as a manufacturing town, particularly for the production of certain woollen cloths, which, singularly enough, were called *cottons*, a corruption of 'coatings.'

Pacific to the Indian Archipelago, he visited several of the islands and returned by the Cape of Good Hope to England, where he arrived in September, 1588. 'This voyage was highly instrumental in forwarding the Queen's design of opening a direct trade with the East Indies. The merchants of London were so impressed with the importance of the information, communicated by Cavendish, that they formed themselves into a trading company, and applied to the Queen for a charter. Their request was granted, and in December 1600, the merchant adventurers were incorporated under the title of 'The Governor and Company of Merchants of London, trading to the East Indies.'

Such was the origin of that mercantile association, which has attained, at the present day, to a higher degree of magnitude and importance than any similar corporation in the annals of commercial history. The subscriptions or shares were at first only 50*l.* each, and the original capital 369,891*l.* 5*s.* In 1676, this capital was doubled, by adding the profits to the stock. In the charter of incorporation, the first governor, Thomas Smythe, and twenty-four directors, were nominated by the crown, but power was vested in the proprietors to elect a deputy-governor, and a governor, and other members for the future. In pursuance of the privileges granted by this charter, the new company dispatched five ships, under the command of Captain Lancaster, which reached the roads of Achen on the 5th of June, 1602. One or two commercial treaties were concluded with the kings of the country, after which, and the completion of their cargo, the little squadron returned home, having made a most profitable voyage. Their success led to other voyages, generally attended by the same prosperous results.

We have not space to proceed with any detail of the difficulties the company had to contend with in the outset; the alternating states in the prosperity and decline of its affairs during the reigns of successive English monarchs; the course of its contentions with the rival French East India Company, and the wars of the English with the native princes, until, by the exertions of Watson, Clive, and Coote, British supremacy was established in Bengal and the Carnatic, and the French empire in India was totally annihilated; but the reader will find the transactions and occurrences narrated by Dr. Taylor with as much brevity and conciseness, and at the same time with as much necessary minuteness, in the two chapters devoted to them, as is requisite for the purposes of general instruction and reference. That most interesting portion of the history of British India, from the establishment of the English supremacy to the conclusion of the administration of Warren Hastings, including the wars with Hyder Ali and the important affairs of the Carnatic, is

comprised in the four succeeding chapters. Before introducing the account of the legislative proceedings at home respecting India, towards the close of the premiership of Lord North, Dr. Taylor alludes incidentally to the character of Hastings' Indian administration, observing that 'his proceedings began now to excite much dissatisfaction in England; several of his measures were reprobated by the Court of Directors, and, at length, on the 8th of February, 1785, he resigned his office, and embarked for England. Few rulers of any country have had to encounter more difficulties, and meet so many extraordinary temptations as Mr. Hastings, during his administration in Bengal. His government was, on the whole, popular, both with the English residents and the natives; nor must it be forgotten, whatever may have been his defects, that he was the first, or among the first, servants of the Company, who attempted to acquire any language of the natives, and who set on foot those liberal inquiries into the literature and institutions of the Hindûs, which have led to the satisfactory knowledge of the present day.' We were disappointed at finding the subject of his celebrated impeachment dispatched in a very few lines, on the plea that the circumstances connected with it belong to the history of England rather than of India. Now, we must confess that we cannot perceive the reasonableness of this plea. The trial in question is one of the most interesting of episodes in the annals of our Indian transactions; and amidst a mass of matter comparatively unattractive to most readers for whom this volume is designed, it would have been, we think, a pleasing relief to have found a more detailed account of this celebrated cause. We are justified in this remark, inasmuch as there are several transactions narrated in the work that might, we apprehend, have been more profitably excluded for the like reason. Warren Hastings, on his return home, was impeached by the House of Commons at the bar of the Lords. The trial commenced on the 13th of February, 1788, and ended on the 23rd of April, 1795, in the acquittal of the accused. 'We need only say,' observes the author, 'that Mr. Hastings was mainly indebted for his escape to the eloquence of his accusers; they overstated their case so monstrously that they excited public sympathy for the criminal, and the applause bestowed on their flights of oratory placed them before the public in the light of very graceful actors, not as persons engaged in a grave and serious transaction.' For a more full and satisfactory detail of this memorable trial, Mr. Mills' is the work to be consulted. Its calm and philosophical tone, the author's impartiality and love of truth and justice, and discriminating appreciation of the conduct and character of Hastings, as well as just estimate of the diffi-

culties and temptations under which he acted in his stormy administration, give a peculiar value to his work as a history. With regard to the issue of the trial, there are other facts and circumstances to be mentioned besides what is stated above. There were many things which detracted from the value and authority of this acquittal, notwithstanding the palliations suggested on behalf of the accused, and perhaps justly suggested by the candour of the historian. It has been frequently urged as an undeniable position, and the result of this cause may be regarded as a standing exemplification of its truth, that the House of Lords, from its constitution and character, is unfit to act as a judicial tribunal. It is a political assembly, consisting of the two opposite parties, the one against, and the other in favour of the ruling power; being thus exposed to the corrupting influence of politics, it is generally governed, even in its judicial capacity, by the minister of the day, of which, in our more recent history, we have had ample proofs. Essentially, then, it wants impartiality;* and in the case of Hastings, there were other sources of delusion. There was the hope of sharing in the wealth of India, which had now become a dominant passion, it swayed all the higher classes, the peers included, who lent a reluctant ear to the charges; and this, added to the reputed favour of the king for the accused, rendered the prosecution unpopular. The mode of conducting the defence, too, tended to lessen the value of the acquittal. It was precisely that of a consciously guilty person. Hastings shrunk from, rather than courted, inquiry, and availed himself of all the legal subtleties of a technical defence. The production of certain papers was constantly objected to by him, and much evidence excluded. Is it unreasonable to suppose, therefore, that had he felt conscious of his innocence, and anxious to make it clear to the confusion of his enemies, he would have adopted a line of defence directly the reverse?

Lord Cornwallis assumed the administration of Indian affairs in the month of September, 1786, soon after which came on the war with Tippoo Sultan, which continued during the administration of Sir John Shore (afterwards Lord Teignmouth), and was brought to an end under that of Lord Mornington (the late Marquis of Wellesley), who arrived in Calcutta as governor-general on the 17th of May, 1798. The attack on Seringapatam, and the death of Tippoo, are thus narrated by Doctor Taylor:—

* To be convinced of this, let any one, bearing in mind that the accusation of Hastings was commenced by the Whig party, inspect the list of peers, who voted him '*guilty*' and '*not guilty*,' and he will find that the Whig lords present regularly replied in the former, and the Tory lords as regularly in the latter terms.

'General Harris now prepared to execute the intention he had formed of crossing the Cavary, near Soosilly, if it should appear practicable, and of attacking Seringapatam on the western side, in order to facilitate the juncture of the Bombay army, and of the supplies of grain which were expected to come through the western passes. This movement was wholly unexpected by Tippoo; and when he heard that it had been successfully accomplished, he was filled with despair. Having assembled the whole of his principal officers, he said to them, 'We have arrived at our last stage; what is your determination?' 'To die along with you,' was the universal reply.

'On the 5th of April, 1799, the English army appeared before Seringapatam. The labours of the siege proceeded steadily until the 4th of May, which was chosen for the assault. The time fixed was one o'clock, when the orientals usually take some repose during the heat of the day. Seyed Goffhar, Tippoo's ablest officer, sent word to the Sultan that the English were about to make an attack, but Tippoo, misled by astrological predictions, refused to credit the report; and while the Seyed was deliberating on forcing the Sultan to the breach, he was killed by a cannon-shot. Nearly at the same moment, Tippoo received information that his bravest general had fallen, and that the assault was commenced. At half-past one o'clock General Baird stepped out of the trenches, drew his sword, and gave the signal to advance. In less than seven minutes after, the English colours were planted on the summit of the breach. The companies of the two storming divisions wheeled to the right and left as they ascended, fighting their way along the northern and southern ramparts, where every inch of ground was fiercely contested. Thousands fell before the victorious soldiers, and the carnage did not cease until the two divisions met on the eastern rampart. Nothing now remained to be taken but Tippoo's palace, the surrender of which was only delayed by the uncertainty that prevailed respecting the fate of the Sultan. Tippoo had fallen in the heat of the fight, severely wounded by three musket balls: whilst he lay on the ground, an English soldier attempted to tear off his embroidered sword-belt, but the Sultan, who still retained his sabre, made a cut at the man, and wounded him in the knee. The soldier immediately shot him through the head, and his death must have been instantaneous. It was late in the evening before the Sultan's body was found and recognised; but in the meantime, his family had been taken under the protection of the British officers. The body was buried the next day, with military honours, in the mausoleum of Hyder Ali, and a violent storm of thunder and lightning, which destroyed several Europeans and natives, gave an awful interest to these last solemn rites.'—p. 193.

Into the administration of the financial and judicial affairs of India, Lord Cornwallis introduced many important changes (the details of which are given in Mr. Mill's work), which, however, were not so successful as his military operations. They are briefly summed up as follows:—He designed to constitute the

Zemindars, or collectors of the land revenue, a body of landed proprietors, renting their Zemindaries as estates from the Company, and paying the land-tax as a species of rent. This project, which showed utter ignorance of the peculiar tenure of land in India, brought ruin on the Zemindars, and inflicted severe injury on the ryots or cultivators of the soil. Many of the judicial reforms were inapplicable to the social condition of India, and therefore failed to produce the beneficial results which had been too eagerly anticipated. The government of Lord Wellesley was a very interesting and brilliant, but at the same time, a very expensive one. His policy aimed at placing the entire military arrangements of India under the control of the British—a policy which, if carried out, would clearly have given the Company an absolute dominion over all the foreign relations of the Indian princes, and rendered that body the guardian of general tranquillity. Great expenses, indeed, had been incurred, but it was certain that the pressure would only be temporary, for the revenues were beginning to improve, the conquered and ceded districts began to grow profitable after tranquillity had been restored, and the economic reductions, which were commenced as the war drew to a close, gave promise of a large and early surplus revenue from our possessions. The Court of Directors, from the beginning, took a very harsh view, as we are told, of Lord Wellesley's policy, and thwarted him in every particular, where they were not checked by the interference of the Board of Control. The Marquis of Cornwallis, in spite of his accumulated years and infirmities, was appointed the successor of Lord Wellesley; but in the midst of his exertions he sank under the increased fatigue which he had imposed upon himself by a journey to the upper provinces. He was succeeded by Sir George Barlow, a civil servant of the company, who had filled several subordinate situations creditably, but who did not possess the qualifications necessary for a post of so much importance and responsibility as that of governor-general.

Lord Minto reached India in July, 1807, as successor to Sir George Barlow. Of his administration Sir John Malcolm observes, 'that it differs essentially from that of every governor-general who preceded him. It was impossible for a man possessed of such clear intellect, and so well acquainted with the whole scheme of government, to be long in India without being satisfied that the system of neutral policy which had been adopted, could not be persevered in without the hazard of great and increasing danger to the state. His calm mind saw at the same time the advantage of reconciling the authorities in England to the measures which he contemplated. Hence, he ever preferred delay, where he thought that it was unaccompanied with

danger, and referred to the administration at home, whom he urged, by every argument he could use, to sanction the course he deemed best suited to the public interests. But this desire to conciliate and carry his superiors along with him, did not result from any dread of responsibility, for wherever the exigency of the case required a departure from this general rule, he was prompt and decided.' In 1813, Lord Minto returned to England, where a sudden illness shortly afterwards terminated his useful life.

The Marquis of Hastings arrived in Calcutta, October 13th, 1813, with the authority of governor-general; and at such a time it was fortunate that the government of India was entrusted to a nobleman equally distinguished for his diplomatic and military attainments, and who had given many signal proofs of his talents as a soldier and a statesman. At the close of his administration, as Doctor Taylor well observes, the situation of the British power was very different from what it had been when that nobleman first assumed the reins of government. The Company's territories were greatly enlarged, and their revenues increased; the Pindarries were annihilated; the power of the Mahrattas, the most formidable enemies of the British, was annihilated; and Scindia, the only ruler whose resources were undiminished, had shown by all his acts, that he had ceased to cherish any plans of ambition. In 1823, Lord Hastings returned to England, after having filled the station of governor-general for nine years. Differences of opinion may exist regarding some minor points of his government, but none of these points are of a character which can in any degree affect that admiration which is given to all the great measures of his political administration.

In the succeeding chapter, Doctor Taylor relates some interesting particulars of the state of India at the close of the Mahratta war, and treats on the affairs of Hyderabad, the mutiny of Vellore, the disputes and controversy with the Burmese, and the kingdom of Lahore under Runjeet Singh. This brings us to the administration of Earl Amhurst and the Burmese war, one of the longest, and perhaps interesting portions of the volume, on which, however, we lament our inability, from want of space, to dwell. We now arrive at the assumption of the governor-generalship of India by Lord William Bentinck, and his successor, Lord Auckland, and the beginning of the Affghan war. The circumstances under which the former nobleman entered on his arduous duties were of peculiar delicacy and difficulty. Such had been the unavoidable expenditure incurred by previous events of an important character, which had added thirteen millions to the registered debt of the Company, while the outlay of the government far exceeded the resources from which it was to

be defrayed, that the necessity of retrenchment was earnestly urged by the Court of Directors, and the new governor appeared at Calcutta in the unpopular character of a financial reformer. Independent of this, one of his first measures was the publishing of a proclamation, strictly forbidding the practice of *suttee*,—that is, of burning or burying alive the widows of Hindûs. Two remarkable projects were contemplated during his administration, which, as they are incidentally alluded to in Lord Auckland's declaration of his reasons for undertaking the Affghan war, we shall give briefly in Doctor Taylor's own words:—

'The general tranquillity of India during Lord William Bentinck's administration, afforded an opportunity for the prosecution of two great projects, the consequences of which have not been yet fully developed,—the opening of communications with the countries west of the Indus, between that river and the Caspian sea, and the establishment of a steam communication between England and India. The primary object in forming any connexion with the countries west of the Indus, was the extension of British commerce. It was believed that it would be possible to open markets for the sale of British manufactures in the great trading cities of Central Asia; the goods being conveyed by steam-boats up the Indus, and then transported by native merchants across the mountain-passes of the Indian Caucasus. In order to facilitate this desirable object, Lord William Bentinck, during his northern progress, had an interview with Runjeet Singh, the ruler of Lahore, which was one of the most gorgeous displays of oriental magnificence that can be imagined. The King of Lahore expressed himself favourable to such an extension of intercourse, and with rather greater difficulty, the Ameers of Scinde were induced to adopt the same course of policy. Lieutenant, afterwards Sir Alexander Burnes, was encouraged by the governor-general to undertake an exploring tour through the countries of Central Asia, then almost unknown. This enterprising traveller collected very important information respecting the political condition, the commercial relations, and the geographical features of the countries between the Caspian and the Indus; and his subsequent publication of his travels excited a considerable share of public attention in England.'—p. 373.

Lord William Bentinck quitted India in March, 1835. Financial derangements threw a gloom over the close of his administration. The fluctuations to which the government loans were liable, and the ruinous speculations unfortunately entered into by the houses of agency established at Calcutta, brought on a commercial crisis which, in the many bankruptcies it occasioned, inflicted a fearful loss on the commercial community of Calcutta, and reduced many officers to a state of the greatest distress. On this portion of Indian history the author is indebted to 'Mr. Auber's closing remarks on Lord William Bentinck's administration,' from which, as they are equally distinguished by their

force and truth, we regret that we can only find room for the closing extract:—

'The Court of Directors, on learning that his lordship's health constrained him to relinquish the government, passed the following resolution on the 26th of September, 1834:—

'Resolved,—That this court deeply lament that the state of Lord William Bentinck's health should be such as to deprive the Company of his most valuable services; and this court deem it proper to record, on the occasion of his lordship's resignation of the office of governor-general, their high sense of the distinguished ability, energy, zeal, and integrity, with which his lordship has discharged the arduous duties of his exalted station.'

From the time when Lord William Bentinck left India (March, 1835), to the middle of the following year, there was no resident governor-general, owing to the peculiar state of political parties at home. In the meantime, therefore, the supreme authority at Calcutta devolved on Sir Charles Metcalfe, whose brief administration was marked by several concessions to popular opinion, particularly by the abolition of all restrictions on the freedom of the press. On the 4th of July, 1836, Lord Auckland landed at Calcutta, and assumed the reins of government, which everything seemed to promise would not be less pacific under his hands, than under those of his predecessor. His lordship was known to be a consistent supporter of a pacific policy, and eager to carry out those schemes of social improvement which require a period of perfect tranquillity for their full development. His earliest attention was engaged to promote the designs which had been formed for the advancement of native education, and the communication of so much knowledge to the Mohammedans and Hindûs as they were willing to receive. He undertook to improve and facilitate the modes of collecting the landed revenue, corrected the method of impost, and arranged plans calculated to have the best effect in securing property, and preventing encroachment and oppression. He carried out gradually, but steadily, an amended judicial system to the full extent of his powers, and substituted the vernacular tongue for the foreign languages, Arabic and Persian, which were formerly in use, in all courts and administrative transactions,—a measure that, for the first time, made the public proceedings of the Indian government intelligible to its subjects. These and many other similar measures endeared his government to the people, and the administration of Lord Auckland may safely be pronounced to have been, on the whole, a decidedly popular one.

He had not long been in possession of the supreme authority, when circumstances occurred which induced him to enter deeply into the troubled politics of Central and Western Asia, and

eventually to involve his government in a struggle, of which the final issue is yet uncertain. This was an unhappy step, which tended, in addition to its other evils, to detract from his otherwise able and enlightened administration. It is generally admitted that he was drawn into an acquiescence in measures for commencing and carrying on the war in Affghanistan without due reflection as to the consequences, upon insufficient information, and at the instance of certain *attachés*, in whose disinterestedness and sagacity he reposed too great a confidence; these persons gave to facts and events their own colouring, and thus misled his better judgment. Lord Auckland, we are told on good authority, did not sufficiently dissect the motives and objects of his functionaries, nor endeavour to detect the bias under which they acted. Doctor Taylor devotes a chapter to the rise and progress of this criminal war, in which, like all preceding writers, he fails to adduce anything like valid or tangible grounds for its being undertaken. The principal authority he relies on, is the manifesto of the governor-general himself, which is too long for insertion here. But what is wanted is, more light thrown upon antecedent relations and events, which even the work of Mr. Masson fails to supply. On the whole, we can recommend this chapter on the Affghan war, as an able, succinct, and generally impartial account of its important transactions down to the forcing of the Khyber Pass, by General Pollock. The remaining portions of the book, which treat on the Chinese war, and on the English dependencies in the Indian seas, as Ceylon, Singapore, Pulo Penang, Malacca, and the Mauritius, are instructive, and well worthy of the rest of the volume.

Art. VII. *The Advancement of Religion, the Claim of the Times.* By Andrew Reed, D.D. London: Snow. 1843.

Dr. Reed says that 'a considerable part of this book is *suggestive.*' So we have found it to be, and as such we shall treat it; comparing or contrasting, now and then, his suggestions for the advancement of religion with the *catholicons* of others. We bespeak, at the outset, therefore, his patience, and the confidence of our readers in our good intentions, and the sympathy of both in our good humour. We want his book to be generally read, for the reasons we shall assign, and his suggestions to be talked over as well as pondered; but we can only make sure of this by a conversational style. Indeed, we cannot combine pathos with point as he does. We have both wept and trembled, as well as rejoiced, in the perusal of his volume, and in that spirit should

prefer to write, were our appeal to Christians only. But as it is not Christians alone that notice the evils which he proposes to remedy, we must address our remarks to the known condition of the parties whom we are desirous of influencing.

The title of this work is now the watch-word of all churches and religious societies. They do not all mean by religion, nor by the advancement of it, the same thing; and thus do not try to advance it in the same way or spirit. But, whatever they mean by religion, they are fully bent upon advancing it, and evidently because 'the Times' require special measures for that purpose.

Popery feels and avows this fact, and thus virtually acknowledges that the ordinary routine of her 'enchantments' can neither spread nor preserve her sway in times like the present. Accordingly, she has unfurled her old missionary banner, and in PARIS first! for the conversion of heathen and heretics; and that chiefly by the prayers of the *Archie-Confrérie;* the members of which, in Paris, increased last year, at the rate of ten thousand a month, and now amount to millions on the Continent; all pledged to pray to the Virgin for the conversion of England, and the Romanizing of the world. Thus infallibility proclaims from the Vatican, and without thunder, that the advancement of religion is *the* claim of the times; and, for once, his Holiness is right; or, not so far wrong as some who deny his infallibility. He resigns his anathemas to Mr. Palmer, of Oxford, and instead of adding more candles to the altar, lets the faithful pray without book for our conversion. Episcopacy also sees and owns in the times, an imperative claim for the advancement of religion, and is meeting it by building new churches, and enforcing old rubrics, and flirting with Babylon. Some of the champions of the church,—like the governor-general of India, who sees in the times there, reasons for restoring the gates of Somnauth to the Hindoos, from whom the Mahomedans stole them ages ago,—see in the times here, that the altar is no longer safe without the candles, nor the pulpit without the surplice, nor the Sabbath without the festivals, that popery stole from paganism. Accordingly, like 'the gates of Somnauth,' these Palladiums are coming back by 'proclamation,' to their old shrines; for, strange to tell, whilst poor Lord Ellenborough is both lampooned and denounced for symbolizing with Hindooism, our home-traders in and licensed hawkers of heathen '*sandal-wood*,' although symbolizing quite as much with popery, are deemed the pillars of the church! We have read, as in duty bound, all the published 'mysteries of *Isis*,' for meeting the claims of the times by the advancement of religion; but we have found none of their nostrums either so rational or Scriptural as the prayer-crusade of the Archie-confrérie. Indeed, neither secret prayer,

except on saints days, nor the Bible, except in church, might have any connexion with the advancement of religion, for anything that Puseyism writes to commend them. Its sole remedy for all that is evil or ominous in our new times, is the ritual of old times.

The church of Scotland takes another and very different view of the claims of the times. Instead of trying to bring back anything that John Knox threw *out* of the kirk, she is trying to keep all that he brought *into* it. She thinks, and justly, that neither the crown nor the civil courts ought to control her spiritual jurisdiction, nor patronage to intrude her ministry. She sees that her people cannot be kept within her pale, nor her pale itself be kept evangelical, in such times as the present, by the nominees of lords, lairds, or cabinets. Many of her best sons, therefore, are ready to unfurl the old banner of the Covenant on the blue hills of Scotland, and to follow it, if necessary, like the covenanters, at all hazards. Vital presbyterianism, in the kirk, deems a demonstration of this kind to be one of the imperative duties of the times; and vital presbyterianism *out* of the kirk, feels that it owes to the times, to welcome the fellowship of all voluntary churches that hold the Head, as well as to revise somewhat its own standards. In regard to Methodism, except its spirited protests against Puseyism, we are not aware of any new public measure which that hard working church has adopted, in order to meet the claims of the times. Perhaps, her old machinery, if well worked, will enable her to serve her generation better than she could do by other means.

So far, we have not referred to anything that is common to all churches, for advancing religion; and for a little still, we must just glance at what is peculiar or new amongst dissenters at this crisis. Not, however, that we are about to embroil ourselves in any of the points at issue between baptists and pædobaptists. We expect, indeed, to put both denominations into good humour with each other, and with ourselves too, by telling them kindly of the somewhat *new* forms that the times have given to their old disputes. Now, Puseyism is their mutual dread, especially as it advocates baptismal regeneration more plausibly than was wont in the olden time; and, therefore, the advancement of religion against this baneful heresy, is one of the claims of our own times on each party. Both know to a certainty—we were about to say, instinctively—that they have no sympathy whatever with the regenerationists, except pity for their infatuation. The call made upon each denomination to dismiss from its fellowship all members belonging to the other; or, upon such members to withdraw at once, and rally under their own baptismal banner, was therefore peculiarly ill-timed, however well meant; for it

was aping in a small way the exclusiveness of episcopacy, without even the paltry excuse of protesting against heresy or schism. Of the same kind, also, are all the suspicions, on both sides, of envy or ill will. Neither side is really convinced of their truth, nor glad to find any grounds for them. The deepest, and dearest, and most vital conviction of both denominations is, that neither prefers its peculiarity to the gospel, or would care the turning of a straw for even the *universality* of its own baptism, apart from its own glorying in the cross of Christ. Both would weep and tremble alike over either a sprinkled or an immersed world, if it were not also 'mighty in the Scriptures,' and thus, in the position of being 'baptized with the Holy Ghost and with fire.' In like manner, both are of one heart and one mind, in regard to the rampant errors of the times, and rely mainly on each other, so far as their reliance is at all human, for the energies that will fight the battle of the Reformation again, should that become necessary. They have no mutual suspicions of each other's love or zeal for the gospel. Should a 'field day' come, the church would not find them *two* denominations, but *one* army, with the same banner and watchword. Besides, as the *first* missionary churches, they have both the confidence and sympathy of all the missionary churches in the world with them. Even those that differ most from them, admire their missionary spirit, and feel that, as they were the fathers of this spirit, so will they be its defenders, even if its defence should cost *blood* as well as labour and money. They seem to *themselves*, occasionally, to be on the eve of an open rupture, or of a final breach; but this is all mere seeming; and that only to themselves. The church sees nothing of the kind in their squabbles. She sees, indeed, that they occasionally agitate each other, and thus give her short intervals of rest; but she knows that they agitate each other only as the stars do, around a magnetic centre that binds them to 'their courses,' and blends their lights. No nonconformist union appears to the hierarchy so indissoluble as that of the Independents and Baptists; and just because it is a *spiritual* union, that their own differences cannot disturb; for even these throw them, for ever, direct upon its foundation—the New Testament; and thus further off than ever from all hierarchical and political influence. 'The Church' thinks, at times, that she can make something of Methodism, and that her state-anchorage has an ally in Presbyterianism; but she never dreams even of acquiring any hold on, or deference from, the descendants of Owen or Bunyan, except through her evangelical clergy; and she dislikes to be represented by them, or to be indebted to them for any of her national influence. She may see some room, if not for 'the sole of her foot,' yet for her 'little finger,' on the platform of other

churches; but the waters of Noah presented to Noah's dove not a more unmanageable or hopeless element than pure dissent seems to her. She can conceive of nothing but law, that could make it subside from her, or succumb to her; but she is afraid to play *Canute*, by lashing the waves. She can, when she is in the humour, battle it with Rome, because she knows antiquity quite as well as Rome herself, and thus can keep infallibility at bay, with some appearance of having the best side of the question; but she feels that she might as well quote Chillingworth or Whately to the pope, as quote fathers, councils, or tradition, to dissenters. Not that she thinks them ignorant of antiquity, but because they own no other authority in religion than the New Testament; and thus, like Job's Leviathan, 'laugh at the shaking of spears' from any armory but that of God.

Dr. Reed must forgive us for going a little further yet in our own way. We have often and long wished for a fair opportunity of telling the two great denominations of dissenters, how much they are really 'one body,' and how much they are felt to be so by the hierarchy. We do not wish, however, to mix up his book with our own lucubrations. We shall do justice to it before we close; but, in the meantime, we must try to do justice to the Independents and Baptists, in order to help them to appreciate each other duly; for this they must do before they can act out Dr. Reed's suggestions for the advancement of religion. Now, neither their distinctions nor divisions, as churches, divert the hierarchy from dwelling on their real union around the New Testament. Nothing moves either body a hairbreadth from this 'pillar and ground of the truth.' If they do not always shake hands around that pillar, they never shake it, nor desert it. It is their common and sole centre; and thus it makes them *one* body, and their orbit but one, to the hierarchy. 'High church,' (for we do not refer at all to the church of Christ in the ecclesiastical corporation of England and Ireland,) sees that whilst this union subsists, she can have no great influence in their orbit, nor any moral attraction for them in her own. She, therefore, contents herself with calling them 'wandering stars,' and with leaving nothing between them and 'the blackness of darkness,' but *uncovenanted* mercy. But the very bitterness and frequency with which this is done, betrays, on the part of 'high church,' deep mortification. She knows full well, and feels with all the keenness of an acute sensation, that dissenters have been 'the morning stars' of missionary enterprise; '*wandering*,' only to lead the heathen to Christ. Would Baptists, and Independents, and Methodists, only stay at *home*, and thus not force upon public attention, glaring *contrasts* between 'the apostles of the Lamb' and modern bishops, 'high church' would have more

patience with them; but as they only thin her ranks at home, and take precedence of episcopacy abroad, and must now wield for ever the chief sceptre of missions in the world, she has no patience with them.

Thus have they placed the worldly hierarchy before the world; and, therefore, they must peril the world, if they plague each other, or do not co-operate visibly and cordially. They can keep in check at home, and a-head of abroad, all that is *rampant* in the hierarchy; and as all that is rampant is unscriptural also, and thus ruinous to souls, it is of infinite importance now, that Methodists, Presbyterians, Baptists, and Independents, hold themselves to be 'set' by God 'for the defence of the Gospel,' and not for the diffusion of their peculiarities.

Let the Baptists and Independents, especially, look at their own moral position in Asia, in virtue of the translations of the Scriptures by their missionaries. It is unparalleled in the world, and only surpassed in the history of the church by the completion of the canon. It is the *envy* of all hierarchies that have any dependence on Scripture for the advancement of religion. They see that the two great dissenting missionary societies have done what universities could not, and what must give them an unapproachable vantage-ground for ever, throughout India and China. No gift of bishops to Asia, were they all Hebers and Wilsons, and sent out by dozens, will ever eclipse, or be compared with, the gift of translations, when Asia shall 'turn unto the Lord.' Her *Pentecost* will for ever date from Serampore and Canton. Carey and Morrison will always be her Luther and Wycliffe. What is any opinion these denominations have respecting the precise import of a ceremonial word, or ground of complaint, compared to their mutual position, so sublime, commanding, and responsible, towards 'all Asia?' Why, had the two societies neither personal nor home reasons for vital and visible unity, their mutual relation to Asia alone, as it can never be superseded in time but by themselves, nor forgotten in eternity, ought to make them one in heart and hand, even as God and the Lamb are one.

And now, if we turn from the east to the west, the aspects and claims of things are the same. In the Pacific Ocean, indeed, the London Missionary Society has had the field to itself, so far as the English Baptists are concerned. But in the West Indies, the two societies have been one, both in their trials and triumphs. For what is to divide the martyred Smith, of Demerara, from his all but martyred brethren in Jamaica, or the daring of Knibb from the diplomacy of Dr. Philip, or either of them from the lasting love and veneration of the religious bodies whose joint property they are? And what can separate the invaluable

results produced by the missionaries of the one society in British Guiana, by a method of organized co-operation which has come to be designated, somewhat quaintly, 'The Leader and Ticket System,' from the results not less valuable, and more vast, produced under the same system by the missionaries of the other society in Jamaica? Neither of these great societies, as such, can sympathize in the assiduity or skill which may be displayed in any quarter, in picking *holes* in the garment of its fellow, or in the folly which would obliterate by wholesale those evangelical honours that cannot be denied to one society without being withheld from both. Each has brilliant proofs of visible success, which may challenge and endure the scrutiny of the world, as the work of God, although there may be found in both some of the evils which were so conspicuous in the early churches. We would not have either Society blind to, or unwilling to look at anything wrong on both sides, much less that each should look only at the *bright* side of what is the PILLAR of its own camp, and only on the *dark* side of it on the other. The world is in full lynx-gaze on the dark side of both pillars; and let the world gaze and tell too what it sees, we say! But let not the world be led to suspect, and thus to search for, evils it would never have even dreamt of, but for recriminations which, in their haste to correct evils, confounded the good with the bad, or overlooked it. Both Societies can well afford, without at all implicating either their principles or spirit, to make all the concessions and deductions too, that even an enemy would demand, in the case of the West Indian and Polynesian churches. It is as much the *glory* of both Societies not to wink at either the chaff or the tares in their missionary fields, as to possess a harvest of good wheat. And as 'angels will be the reapers' at last, why should the *sowers* strive now? especially as they will soon be both with and 'like the angels of God.'

We do not forget that Jamaica is delicate ground. But we know it too well to be either deterred or intimidated by its delicacy. Indeed, we should feel, and our readers would think, that we had done nothing to the purpose were we to stop here. Besides, we would not have begun at all, had we not seen clearly that Jamaica might be made the grand reason, at this moment, for the unity we advocate and anticipate. Even the waters of Marah may be healed, notwithstanding all their bitterness. Would all who complain of the bituminous springs deplore the bitterness, in the meek spirit of Moses, the Lord would soon 'show them a tree by which the waters might be made sweet.' Dr. Reed sees that tree clearly.

In the meantime, however, all ought to look far more at the

relation of the converted negroes to their own race and country, than at their present relations to British missions, and to identify the Jamaica churches with *Africa*, not with England. Their English relations are dissolving already, as to both their form and degree; and even the spirit of them will soon take a new direction, although not an unfriendly one to their old patrons. Besides, whatever the Jamaica churches become, they can never have any direct influence now upon either the position or progress of any society or denomination at home. They can neither extend nor strengthen here, any of the various names they bear. In reference to Britain, they will just be churches of the same 'order' as her own, and nothing more. Their practical influence upon Protestant churches will be in *America*, and there it will tell powerfully upon all slave-holding churches, if we take care to elevate the native mind and character. It will tell, too, upon both Western and Northern Africa for incalculable good or evil, according as missionaries *sanctify* much or little.

We bespeak and beseech consideration to this view of the Negro churches in the colonies. Whenever they come to feel their own strength, both as Christians and as a people—and they are beginning to find it out already—they will care infinitely more for their brethren in America, and their race in Africa, than about the denominational peculiarities that now divide them. Any notoriety that any sect or society here derives from the proportion in which Negroes are identified with them, will be less than nothing in the estimation of Negroes when they appreciate the *condition* of their 'kindred according to the flesh,' all over the world. Even then, indeed, they may retain their present ecclesiastical distinctions, and spread them, too, in the usual spirit of rivalry; but they will be as 'the heart of one man' on behalf of their chained brethren in America, and of the homes of their fathers in Africa. Wisely or unwisely, but certainly with ardent and indomitable spirit, they will move upon both, and find means to make the American churches hear and heed them, and the African tribes to welcome them. This is their destiny, and will soon be their grand distinction. The intelligence and purity of the Negro churches, therefore, ought to be the supreme concern of all the Societies they belong to. Each is unspeakably interested in—yea, responsible for the tone of mind and character that must thus re-act soon upon two Continents. For, we repeat it, the African churches in the colonies can never prove or promote at home any of the peculiarities of any church. They can only be a *credit* or a *disgrace* to the communions whose name they bear, and the Societies that now influence them. No folly, therefore, can be more egregious, nor

any crime more fatal, than to check holy jealousy of their intelligence or purity, whatever quarter it comes from; or, on the other hand, to cherish such jealousy as is likely to exasperate the warm, or discourage the weak, whatever motive be assigned for it. The wise formation of African character, for African purposes all over the world, cannot be secured by either extreme candour, or extreme rigidness. Whoever would screen the Negro churches from the scrutiny of the New Testament, or subject them to tests that would unchristianize the churches at home, is not their friend, nor the friend of Africa. Undue leniency can only prolong the childish and superstitious elements of the African mind, and undue rigour only irritate the fiery and sanguine elements of it. Well saith the Scripture, 'He that ruleth over men should be just, and as the light of the morning when the sun riseth on a morning without clouds.' (2 Sam. xxiii. 3.)

We are not insensible to, nor unsympathizing with, the position in which the missionaries of all the Societies in Jamaica have placed themselves, and each other, on this subject. Arbitrating between them, however, even if we were capable of doing so, would not secure their own chief object; for, after all, no one can doubt that it is their chief desire to lead on the African mind to both manliness and godliness, although by somewhat different processes. Each of them, therefore, will find both his justification and reward eventually, not from any adjudication of the points on which they are now at issue, but in the holy results which all their hearts love, and long to realize. Let them only train the Negroes to regenerate Africa, and Europe, America, and Asia will soon do them ample justice and honour.

Such are some of the trains of thought and feeling that Dr. Reed's work has suggested to us; and if we have hitherto given more prominence to our own opinions than to his positions, it has been from any cause but disrespect to him or his book. Our real and sole object in writing as we have done is, that his book may not be confounded at all with our opinions, nor be supposed to go into the questions we have mooted upon his hints. We believe that we have been both thinking out some of his best hints, and carrying out his grand design by the process we have thus far pursued. This may be a mistake on our part. Be that as it may, however, we have no apology to make to him or any one else for our well-meant effort to promote 'the unity of the Spirit' amongst the two great bodies of evangelical dissenters.

We would now say, with solemnity and affection, to all who sympathize with the spirit and purpose of this article, study Dr. Reed's work. It is impossible to do so without being alternately abased for our divisions, and filled with wonder and gratitude for the vital elements of unity which we possess.

So far, and too far, perhaps, we have treated Dr. Reed's work as 'suggestive.' But although it suggested, and would justify, were that necessary, both the line and spirit of this article, it is in nowise responsible for either, and ought not to be identified with them at all. This will be obvious from its contents:—1. The Advancement of Religion Desirable. 2. Its Advancement in the Person. 3. By Personal Effort. 4. In the Family. 5. By the Ministry. 6. In the Church. 7. By the Church. 8. In the Nation. 9. In the World. 10. The Certainty and Glory of the Consummation.' It will be seen at once that this is a panoramic view of 'the kingdom of God,' which cannot be analyzed without being injured. Any formal review of it, in detail, would present only such meagre outlines as are given in the description books of a grand panorama. Indeed, we could not have reviewed it in detail, even if we had had no purpose to serve but its own success; and *that*, we are very anxious to promote, for many reasons besides the one we have chiefly yielded to. It is a wise, impressive, and inspiring book, in reference to all the ways in which religion needs and claims to be advanced. It could only have been written by one who had actually tried, long and fully, the experiments it commends. Dr. Reed may well say, 'that all the suggestions are the fruit of actual experiment, or of careful observation and comparison.' Many of them, it is well known, '*have been proved*' during his own successful ministry. It is not, however, a work on revivals, in the technical sense of that word, but is more calculated to *revive* the church than all the revival books of the age put together, his own not excepted. No Christian, public or private, can read it without being revived in all his best feelings, nor without seeing both what is wanted, and how that may be attained; for its real, although not exactly avowed object, is 'to CONVERT Christians to their own opinions.'—*Preface*, p. 7.

This seems a paradox at first sight; but the reader soon finds that his own conversion is going on, even as to those points in his creed, where the cordiality of his faith and love is the chief evidence of his conversion of God. He meets with no new truths, nor even with old truths in very new forms; but somehow, they have new power and glory about them. He finds that there is more meaning in the gospel, and more mind in himself, than ordinary reading or hearing brings out. If he happen to know Coleridge, he is reminded of his expression, 'Giving new force to old truths, that had long lain *bedridden* in the memory.' And then, this force is given to them, not by any stratagem, nor even by studied strokes of eloquence, but by placing them in natural lights and positions, which bring forth both their purpose and proportions at once, as well as the will and power of the mind to apprehend and appreciate them.

Art. VIII. *The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie, A.M., Principal of the University of Glasgow.* Edited from the Author's Manuscripts by David Laing, Esq. In three volumes. Royal 8vo. Vol. III. Edinburgh: Robert Ogle.

In our notice of the former volumes of this beautiful reprint of Principal Baillie's *Letters and Journals*, we intimated an intention, on the completion of the edition, to give a brief sketch of the author's life.* To this task we now address ourselves, and at the outset, beg to acknowledge our obligations to Mr. Laing for the assistance he has rendered us in the *Memoir* subjoined to the present volume. His biographical sketch constitutes a valuable addition to the work, which is brought out in a style alike honourable to the society from which it emanates, and the editor to whom its supervision has been entrusted.

Robert Baillie was born in the Salt-market of Glasgow, on Friday, the 30th of April, 1602, of respectable parents, connected with many families of distinction in the west of Scotland. His early education was received under the parental roof, whence he was removed to the public school, where Robert Blair, an eminent presbyterian divine, was then assistant master. In his 'Historical Vindication of the Government of the Church of Scotland,' dedicated in 1646 to Blair, Baillie makes grateful mention of the benefits received from his early tutor. 'My heart,' he says, 'blesses the goodnesse of God, who in a very rich mercy to me did put almost the white and razed table of my spirit under your hands, after my domestick instructions, which were from mine infancy, to be engraven by your labours and example with my first most sensible and remaining impressions, whether of piety, or of good letters, or of morall vertue; what little portion in any of these it hath pleased the Lord of his high and undeserved favour to bestow upon me: I were ungratefull if I should not acknowledge you, after my parents, the first and principall instrument thereof.'

In 1617, Baillie entered the college of Glasgow, where he took the degree of Master of Arts, in 1620. As he intended to devote himself to the ministry of the church of Scotland, he continued his attendance at college, and was prevented by his straitened means only from visiting one of the foreign universities. During the early part of his college life, Robert Boyd, of Trochrig, 'a man of very singular learning and accomplishments,' was Principal of the university. Boyd was a firm presbyterian, and was consequently distasteful to James I. and his

* New Series. Vol. X., p. 633.

prelatical advisers. He was therefore compelled to resign his office, and was succeeded after the interval of a year by John Cameron, a great favourite of the king. During his brief incumbency, Cameron succeeded in instilling into the minds of his students the doctrine of passive obedience, then so diligently enforced by the parasites of the English court. To this, Baillie alludes in a subsequent period of his life, acknowledging that he 'had drunken in, without examination, from a Master Cameron, in my youth, that slavish tenet, that all resistance to the Supreame Magistrate in anie case was simplie unlawful.'

On the 16th of August, 1625, Baillie was admitted to the office of regent in the college, on which occasion he delivered an inaugural oration, *De Mente Agente*. Six years later, he was appointed to the benefice of Kilwinning, Ayrshire, on the presentation of Hugh, Lord Montgomery, previously to which event, he received orders from James Law, Archbishop of Glasgow. Soon afterwards it was in contemplation to effect his removal to one of the churches in Edinburgh, which caused him to address a letter to his 'verie worthie and much respected friend,' Mr. Robert Fleming, one of the magistrates of that city. This letter, together with the answer which it called forth, is printed by Mr. Laing, and possesses very considerable interest in connexion with the ecclesiastical opinions of Baillie. Whatever those opinions subsequently became, it is obvious from the letter to Mr. Fleming, that he was far from sympathizing at this period with the views of the more zealous and thorough-going presbyterians. 'I pray you remember,' he says, 'that my opinions in religion, which I never mind to dissemble, neither in private nor publict, they are such as could not be tolerat by many now there. To avow and practise manie of the Englishe ceremonies, to count these schismatiques that holds it unlawfull to communicat with kneelers, yow know it to be verie hatefull doctrine to many there; and yet this is my mind, and long soe hes been: Also to preach against all points of Arminianisme and Papistrie, especiallie the doctrine of our new Cassandrian moderators yow know likewayes how hatefull it is to these men who now are able for few words to put their brethren from their ministrie, yea, cast them in the straitest prisones.'

The ecclesiastical policy of the English court at this time was as unwise as it could well be. Instead of regarding the prepossessions of the Scottish people, it sought with a high hand to force episcopacy upon them, reckless alike of the religious grievance and the social disorganizations thereby inflicted. A more thoughtful and moderate course might have accomplished much of what the English court contemplated. The race of old presbyterian ministers would gradually have died off, and sufficient

candidates would have been found conformable to the policy of Charles, who for sordid motives would

'Creep and intrude, and climb into the fold.'

The zeal of Laud, however, was too intemperate to admit of forethought. He hurried on his measures with a fatuity which bordered on madness—on the one hand, alienating the nobility by advancing churchmen to the highest offices of the state, and on the other offending beyond redemption the mass of the people, by forcing on them 'a great and insupportable grievance.' The service-book was proclaimed on the 21st of December, 1636, and Baillie, though alarmed at this attempt to impose a form of service which no one had seen, was yet inclined by his education, habits, and relationships, to comply with the instructions of his ecclesiastical superiors to the utmost extent that conscience permitted. Some of his brethren more perspicacious than himself, and better informed respecting the policy of the English court, saw at once the danger that was threatened, and proclaimed as with the voice of a trumpet that *reconciliation with Popery was intended*. Such was the warning uttered by Samuel Rutherford from his place of confinement at Aberdeen, and the heart of the nation responded to his appeal. The train was thus laid which required only a spark for its ignition, and the explosion for which all thoughtful observers looked, took place in the July following. Of this circumstance and its immediate consequences, Mr. Laing thus speaks:—

'The tumult at Edinburgh, on the 23rd of July, 1637, on occasion of the first using the Service-Book, was the spark which kindled a flame that spread over the whole land. According to the deliberate judgment of the Privy Council, after minute investigation, they could only report to his Majesty that this 'barbarous tumult' proceeded from 'a number of base and rascall people.' It was an act altogether unpremeditated; but the spirit of resistance having thus openly manifested itself, supplications from every part of the Kingdom were presented to the Council, urging, that the service enjoined was contrary to the religion then professed, and that it was introduced in a most unwarrantable manner without the knowledge or approbation of a General Assembly, and in opposition to Acts of Parliament. The clergy, nobility, and all ranks of people, flocked to Edinburgh with such petitions against the use of the liturgy: being encouraged by their increasing numbers, and irritated by delays and by the evasion of their first humble requests, they became sufficiently formidable; and enlarging their demands, they at length succeeded not only in having the service-book withdrawn, but in restoring presbytery in its purest form, and in relieving the Church from the thraldom of her prelatic oppressors. From this time the history of the country is that of the Church, and it exhibits a succession of events partaking more of the

character of romance than of scenes in ordinary life. But the history of that period is so well known, and Baillie's letters furnish so full and distinct an account of the more remarkable occurrences of the time, that in this memoir it will only be necessary to allude to such events as have some relation to the Author himself.'—*p. xxxv.*

Up to this period, Baillie had been favourable to a limited kind of episcopacy. 'Bishops,' he says, 'I love, but pride, greed, luxury, oppression, immersion in secular affairs, was the bane of the Romish prelates, and cannot long have good success in the reformed.' At the desire of his patron, he attended a meeting of the supplicants at Edinburgh in October, on which occasion he was evidently regarded with some distrust by his brethren. Referring to the question put by the chairman to each of the ministers present, respecting their dissent from the service book, Baillie tells us, 'I was posed somewhat more narrowly, because they suspected my mind in those things.' His hesitation, however, to concur in the measures of the more rigid presbyterians, did not arise from any attachment to the service-book, of many parts of which he thoroughly disapproved, whilst his lingering regard to episcopacy was speedily destroyed by the events which transpired. The national covenant was signed on the last day of February, 1838, and a Board of Commissioners entitled 'The Tables,' was instituted in Edinburgh to deliberate on, and manage the affairs of the supplicants.

The events which followed are well known to the historical reader. Charles determined to coerce the Scotch covenanters into obedience, and the latter perceiving his intention, prepared to defend their liberties. The crisis searched deeply into the hearts of men, moving their strongest passions, and shaping their course by the primary interests of their being, rather than by the flimsy theories which the schools had taught them. Baillie abandoned his notion of passive obedience, and on the commencement of hostilities, accompanied Lord Eglintoun as chaplain to his soldiers. The account which he has furnished of the Scottish army as it lay encamped on Dunse Law, about the 7th of June, 1639, is amongst the most graphic and interesting passages of his correspondence. 'It would have done you good,' he says, 'to have cast your eyes athort our brave and rich hill as oft as I did with great contentment and joy. . . . . I furnished to half-a-dozen of good fellows muskets and picks, and to my boy a broad sword. I carried myself, as the fashion was, a sword and a couple of Dutch pistols at my sadle; but I promise for the offence of no man, except a robber in the way; for it was our part alone to preach and pray for the encouragement of our countreymen, which I did to my power most cheerfullie.'

The pacification of Berwick, proclaimed on the 18th of June,

prevented a collision of the hostile forces, and produced a temporary pause in the storm. That pause, however, was but short-lived. Charles had neither the prudence nor the good faith to abide by the terms of the pacification; and the covenanters, encouraged by communications from England, crossed the Tweed in the autumn of 1640. Baillie was summoned to the Scottish forces at Newcastle, whence he was despatched to London as one of the commissioners for conducting the treaty with the king. We need not dwell on the state of parties in England at this time, as it is well known to our readers. A long course of misrule had alienated the people from their governors, and induced even moderate and timid politicians to contemplate changes of which their fathers never dreamed. The iron sway of Strafford, which had shown itself unchecked in the North, and still more cruelly in Ireland, had admonished all thoughtful men of the doom to which English liberty was destined by the ministers of Charles, whilst the infatuated and brutal intolerance of Laud, had arrayed against the government the religious prepossessions of the puritans. The unpopularity of the monarch, and the embarrassed state of his finances, prevented his meeting the Scotch forces in the manner he desired. He advanced as far as York, but was there compelled to summon a great council of his nobility, to whom he announced his intention of immediately convening a parliament as the only means of extricating himself from the difficulties of his position. It was well for English liberty that the popular party possessed at this time such leaders as Pym and Hampden, men who united largeness of intellect, with an inflexibility of purpose which nothing could move, and an integrity that was above all suspicion. Intimately acquainted with the national character, sensible of the wrongs which had been inflicted, and fully assured of the inextinguishable hatred borne by Charles and his ministers to English freedom, these distinguished patriots resolved on a decided, yet calm course, and were well sustained by their associates. 'There was observed,' says Clarendon, 'a marvellous elated countenance in many of the members of parliament before they met together in the House; the same men who six months before were observed to be of very moderate tempers, and to wish that gentle remedies might be applied without opening the wound too wide and exposing it to the air, and rather to cure what was amiss, than too strictly to make inquisition into the causes and original of the malady, talked now in another dialect both of things and persons.'*

But we must not leave the biography of Baillie for general

* Hist. of Rebellion. Vol. I., p. 298.

history, however tempting the theme. Suffice it, therefore, to remark that the state of feeling which he found prevalent in London, was equally untemporizing, intense, and practical, as that which he had witnessed in Edinburgh. He was early engaged in drawing up *The Charge of the Scottish Commissioners against Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Earl of Strafford*, which was presented to the House of Lords on the 17th of December, and in the publication of several controversial treatises against the service-book, Arminianism and Episcopacy. His account of Strafford's trial, contained in the early portion of his correspondence, furnishes the most graphic view which has been preserved to us of that memorable event, that constituted the first act of the most solemn and imposing drama ever acted on the theatre of a great nation.

Baillie returned to Scotland in June 1641, and was a member of the General Assembly which met at St. Andrew's in the following month. A professorship was offered him in each of the four universities, and a design was entertained, by some of his friends, of effecting his removal to a parochial charge in Glasgow. As long as was practicable, he resisted these efforts to remove him from his beloved charge at Kilwinning. Finding, however, 'that the Assembly, which possessed uncontrolled power in such matters, might at once order him to be translated to some place less congenial to his habits than that of his birth and education, and where he still would be in the midst of his friends and relations, he, with some reluctance, in June 1642, accepted the invitation to become Dickson's colleague as joint professor of divinity in the university of Glasgow.'

He was not destined long to remain in the comparative obscurity of his academical life, for in the following year we find him again in London as a Commissioner to the Assembly of Divines. He took an active part in the consultations of his brethren, and was especially relied on for the diligence and accuracy with which he dissected the controversial writings of their opponents. The unsatisfactory state of the parliament's affairs compelled the English patriots to make advances to the Scotch, who, availing themselves of the critical position of their allies, insisted on the adoption of *the Solemn League and Covenant*, as the basis of union between the two kingdoms. 'The English,' says Baillie, 'were for a civil league; we, for a religious covenant. When they were brought to us in this, and Mr. Henderson had given them a draught of a covenant, we were not like to agree on the frame; they were, more than we could assent to, for keeping of a door open in England to independency. Against this we were peremptory.' A compromise was at length effected by the adoption of a general phraseology, which each party hoped to have interpreted according to its own views.

Baillie returned to Scotland early in 1645, to report to the General Assembly the progress of presbyterianism in England. He set out from London, in company with George Gillespie, on the 6th of January, and arrived at Newcastle on the 18th, 'verie wearie and fashed with a long evill way.' To the Assembly, which met at Edinburgh, he reported the unanimity with which the English parliament had abolished the ceremonies and service book, and had plucked up the 'root of all the branches of episcopacies in all the king's dominions.' A confident expectation was expressed of the speedy establishment of presbyterianism according to the forms of the *Directory*, and the fullest complacency was avowed in the actual and prospective state of things. 'Such stories lately told,' remarked Baillie, 'would have been counted fancies, dreams, mere impossibilities; yet this day we tell them as deeds done, for the great honour of God, and we are persuaded the joy of many a godlie soul. If any will not believe our report, let them trust their own eyes; for behold here are the warrant of our words, written and subscryved by the hands of the clerks of the parliament of England, and the scribes of the assemblie there.'

He speedily returned to London, where he preached before the House of Lords, July 30th, entitling his sermon, which was afterwards printed by order of the House, *Errours and Induration are the great Sins and the great Judgments of the Times.* About the same period, he published his *Dissuasive from the Errors of the Time;* in the course of which he bitterly inveighed against the numerous sects which claimed toleration from the government, and denounced such toleration as a grievous evil. His hopes were greatly moderated at this time, by the inability of his countrymen to strengthen their army in England. Montrose held them in check by his rapid and devastating movements, and the Scotch commissioners consequently despaired of making a satisfactory settlement of ecclesiastical affairs. Referring to some controverted point in which the views of his party were opposed by the Independents, he remarks with a simplicity which creates a smile, 'with which we propose not to meddle in haste, until it please God to advance our armie, *which we expect will much assist our arguments*,' and, at a later date, he adds, 'Had our armie been but one 15,000 men in England, our advyce would have been followed quicklie in all things.' Baillie was not far wrong in his opinion, but happily for religious liberty the Scotch army could neither advance nor be reinforced, and the English patriots were in consequence free to reject the ecclesiastical servitude which the presbyterians sought to impose. Mr. Laing speaks in much milder terms than the occasion demands, of the persecuting tenets of the presbyterians of this period. We are

sorry he has done so, as the honour of his own system, as well as the fidelity of history, require an unhesitating condemnation of the principles they promulgated, and the spirit of which they were the impersonation. The facts of the case are too glaring to admit of contradiction, and they constitute a salutary lesson, the force of which ought not to be diminished by such diluted statements as the following:—

'It is usual to assert that the first correct notions of toleration or religious liberty originated with the Independents. The Presbyterians in both kingdoms were indeed strongly opposed to allowing toleration of any sects; and it must be admitted that the Ecclesiastical Courts, Presbyterian as well as Prelatic, when they had the power, displayed no unequivocal symptoms of inquisitorial judicatures. Had Church-government been established in both kingdoms, in the form proposed, doubtless in such an event the rules of discipline would have been strictly enforced, and their proceedings might, in some measure, have justified the ordinary accusations of intolerance and persecution. But when we look into the history of that period and consider the effects of such licence in the rapid growth of heresies of all kinds, and the bitter spirit that was engendered among the various sects, it would be unjust to accuse Baillie and his friends as alone chargeable with intolerance; and he himself strives to vindicate the Presbyterians from whatever could be said to evince a persecuting spirit. The Independents, it is true, asserted the right of liberty to themselves in matters of religion, and also urged the plea of toleration of all sects, however erroneous; but it is not less certain that when the full power was in their own hands, they manifested no particular inclination to extend such liberty to their opponents, and more especially *by no means to tolerate any Preacher who shall oppose that their liberty.*'—*p. liv., lv.*

We need not accumulate evidence on this point, as every tyro in English history is familiar with it, and shall therefore pass on to other topics more personal to Baillie.

He returned permanently to Scotland at the close of 1646, and devoted the remainder of his life, except on one occasion, to the duties of his college, or the proceedings of the ecclesiastical courts. The state of affairs in England had now undergone considerable change. Hampden and Pym were dead, the army was new modelled, the field of Naseby had placed the power of the state in the hands of Cromwell, and the king himself was a prisoner. The sectaries were in consequence free from molestations, and the presbyterian members of parliament were coerced into silence by their own soldiery. To the last of these events Baillie alludes in the fifth letter contained in this volume, under date of July 13, 1647. The letter is valuable, as shewing the disposition of the Scotch to arm for the monarch whom they had so stoutly opposed. They hated episcopacy and had fought

against the king as its patron and enforcer, but they regarded independency and Cromwell with all the bitterness of disappointed hope, added to the fierceness of ecclesiastical intolerance. The letter is addressed to William Spang.

'These matters of England are so extremely desperate, that now twyse they have made me sick: except God arise, all is gone there. The imprudence and cowardice of the better part of the City and Parliament, which was triple or sextuple the greater, has permitted a company of silly rascalles, which calls themselves yet no more than fourteen thousand, horse and foot, to make themselves masters of the King, and Parliament, and City, and by them of all England; so that now that disgraced Parliament is but a committee to act all at their pleasure, and the City is ready to fright the parliament at every first or second boast from the army. No humane hope remaines but in the King's unparalleled willfulness, and the armie's unmeasurable pride. As yet they are not agreed, and some writes they are not like to agree: for in our particular I expect certainly they will agree weel enough, at what distance soever their affections and principles stand. Allwayes if the finger of God in their spirits should so farr dement them as to disagree, I would think there were yet some life in the play; for I know the body of England are overwearie long agoe of the Parliament, and ever hated the sectaries, but much more now for this their unexpected treacherie and oppression. On the other part, the King is much pitied and desyred; so if they give him not contentment, he will overthrow them. If he and they agree, our hands are bound: we will be able, in our present posture and humour of our highly distracted people, to doe nothing; and whom shall we goe to help, when none calls but the king? Parliament and City, as their masters command, are ready to declare against us if we should offer to arme: but if the King would call, I doubt not of riseing of the best armie ever we had, for the crushing of these serpents, enemies to God and man.'—pp. 9, 10.

The growing alienation of the Scotch from the English parliament led to a secret treaty termed *The Engagement* between the royalists of the two kingdoms: and a proposal to send an army into England in the summer of 1648 was carried by a small majority. 'Such an enterprise,' as Mr. Laing remarks, 'placed this country in a false position. Hitherto the cause for which Scotland had been contending was to secure the purity and freedom of religious worship, but by such interference the contest assumed a different character, and was in direct opposition to the spirit and tenour of the solemn league. The expedition was strongly opposed by Argyle and others of the nobility, and a great part of the nation, upon the ground either that it was a violation of the treaties with England, or that the king having refused to give an absolute assent to the covenant or to agree to the continuance of presbytery in England for a longer period than three years, they could not support him on such terms.

David Leslie and the most experienced officers likewise refused to act unless the church was satisfied.' The result of the expedition is well known. Instead of averting, it hastened the doom of the infatuated monarch, by disclosing to the English leaders his intrigues, and informing them of the dangers to which they were exposed from their former allies. The execution of the king followed in January, and was announced by Baillie, together with the proclamation of Charles II., to his correspondent, Spang, under date of February 7th, 1649. 'One act of our lamentable tragedy being ended, we are entering,' he remarks, 'again upon the scene.' He reports, a messenger, Sir Joseph Douglas, having proceeded to the Hague to inform the prince of their proceedings, and the intention of the Estates 'speedily to send an honourable commission' to him. Hopes are expressed, not unmingled, however, with many fears, that Charles would be induced to subscribe the *Covenant*, and the utmost confidence is expressed in a unanimous movement in his favour, in case of his doing so.

'If his Majestie may be moved to joyne with us in this one point, he will have all Scotland readie to sacrifice their lives for his service. If he refuse or shift this ducty, his best and most usefull friends, both here and elsewhere, will be cast into inextricable labyrinths, we fear, for the ruine of us all. We know Satan will not want ill instruments to keep him off from a tymeous yielding to this our most earnest and necessare desyre; bot as it is and will be one of all Scotland's strong petitions to God, to dispose his heart to doe his duty without delay, so we will acknowledge ourselves much obliedged to any, whom the Lord may honor, to be the happie instruments of his persuasion.'—p. 66.

Baillie was one of the commissioners appointed to wait on Charles, at the Hague, whither they proceeded in March, and his speech on the occasion has been preserved. He designates the execution of the king an 'execrable and tragick parricide,' and informed his royal listener, in the name of the parties whom he represented, that 'though all men on earth should passe over unquestioned, yet we nothing doubt but the great judge of the world will arise and plead against every one, of what condition soever, who have been either authors, or actors, or consenters, or approvers, of that hardly expressible crime, which stamps and stigmatizes, with a new and before unseen character of infamy, the face of the whole generation of sectaries and their adherents from whose hearts and hands that vilest villany did proceed.'

The commissioners returned without having accomplished their object, and it would have been well both for Scotland and England if no other overtures had been made. Such, however, was not the view of the party now dominant in the Scotch

councils, and the expedition of Charles, with the battles of Dunbar and Worcester were the consequence.

Cromwell was now master of both kingdoms, and it must be acknowledged that, if he did not carry out the patriotic professions of his earlier and better days, he yet acted with a magnanimous forbearance towards his enemies. No other ruler is worthy to be compared with him in this respect, and it constitutes a redeeming feature of his administration which ought not to be forgotten. It was his policy, as Mr. Laing admits, 'to leave the church very much to its own guidance,' and the ordinary meetings of Presbyteries and Synods were therefore unmolested. The General Assembly, however, was a dangerous body, capable of exerting—and heartily disposed to do so—a strong political influence against his government. Its dissolution was therefore resolved on, and the following letter to Mr. Calamy, of London, dated July 27, 1653, gives an account of the manner in which this resolution was effected.

'At this time, I have no more to adde, bot this one word, to let yow know, That on the 20th of July last, when our Generall Assemblie wes sett in the ordinarie tyme and place, Lieutenant-Colonel Cotterall besett the Church with some rattes of musqueteirs and a troup of horse; himself (after our fast, wherein Mr. Dickson and Mr. Dowglass had two gracious sermons,) entered the Assemblie-house, and, immediately after Mr. Dickson, the Moderator, his prayer, required audience; wherein he inquired, If we did sitt there by the authority of the Parliament of the Commonwealth of England? or of the Commanders-in-Chiefe of the English forces? or of the English Judges in Scotland? The Moderator replyed, That we were ane Ecclesiasticall synod, ane Spirituall court of Jesus Christ, which medled not with anything Civile; that our authoritie wes from God, and established by the Lawes of the land yet standing unrepealed; that, by the Solemn League and Covenant, the most of the English army stood obliedged to defend our Generall Assemblie. When some speeches of this kind had passed, the Lieutenant-Colonell told us, his order wes to dissolve us; whereupon he commanded all of us to follow him, else he would drag us out of the rowme. When we had entered a Protestation of this unheard of and unexampled violence, we did ryse and follow him; he ledd us all through the whole streets a myle out of the towne, encompassing us with foot-companies of musqueteirs, and horsemen without; all the people gazing and mourning as at the saddest spectacle they had ever seen. When he had ledd us a myle without the towne, he then declared what further he had in commission, That we should not dare to meet any more above three in number; and that against eight o'clock tomorrow, we should depart the towne, under paine of being guiltie of breaking the publick peace: And the day following, by sound of trumpet, we were commanded off towne under the paine of present imprisonment. Thus our Generall Assemblie, the glory and strength of our Church upon earth, is, by your souldiarie, crushed and trod under

foot, without the least provocatione from us, at this time, either in word or deed. For this our hearts are sadd, our eyes runn downe with water, we sigh to God against whom we have sinned, and wait for the help of his hand; bot from those who oppressed us we deserve no evill.'—pp. 225, 226.

Want of space must limit us to one more extract, which we take from a letter addressed to Spang, and dated May 12, 1662. Our readers are aware of the part acted by the Presbyterians, both Scotch and English, in the restoration of the Stuarts. Nothing could be more ill-judged or reckless than their course, and they suffered bitterly for it. The dupes of a too-confiding credulity, they were laughed at and spurned by the men whom they had handed into power. It was not long before they found out their mistake, and the irreligion, profanity, and licentiousness which spread over the land as locusts, bore witness of their folly. Baillie gives the following account of affairs immediately subsequent to the restoration:—

'The publict affaires yow know them as well and better than I. Our Kirk, all the English tymes, had been very faithfull to our King, and so instrumentall as we could for his restitution. We had lost much blood at Dunbar, Worcester, and elsewhere, and at last our libertie, in his cause. We did firmly expect, at his Restitution, a comfortable subsistence to ourselves, and all our Presbyterian brethren, in all the dominions; and believe the King's intention was no other; but, by divine permission, other counsells thereafter prævailed, and now carry all. When the King was at Breda, it was said he was not averse from establishing the Presbytery; nor was the contrare peremptorily resolved till the Saturday at night, in the cabbin-councell at Canterbury. At the beginning it went on softly; Calamy, Baxter, Manton, Reynold, were made chaplains: but at once it altered. This did come from our supine negligence and unadvertence; for the Parliament, then consisting of the secluded members, the Citie, Monck also, and the Armie, were for us: Had we but petitioned for Presbytrie at Breda, it had been, as was thought, granted; but fearing what the least delay of the King's coming over might have produced, and trusting fully to the King's goodness, we hastened him over, without any provision for our safetie. At that time it was, that Dr. Sheldon now Bishop of London, and Dr. Morley, did poyson Mr. Sharp, our agent, whom we trusted; who, peice and peice, in so cunning a way, hes trepanned us, as we have never win so much as to petition either King, Parliament, or Councell. My Lord Hyde [is] the great Minister of State who guided all, and to whom, at his lodging in Worcester house, the King weekly, and ofter, uses to resort and keep counsell with him alone some hours; and so, with the King, Mr. Sharp became more intimate than any man almost of our nation. It seemes he hes undertaken to doe in our Church that which now he has performed easily, and is still in acting.

'The Parliament of England did all things for the King he pleased;

augmented much his revenue beyond what any King in England ever had. After some conferences at Worcester-house, betwixt the Bishops and a few of the Presbyterians, where it was hoped his Majestie would bring the Bishops to a great condescension, at last it was found they would yield in as good as nothing; so the House of Commons formed a Bill of Uniformity, that all should be put from their charges who did not conforme to the Bishops' orders. On this the House of Lords did make some demurre, and yet does; but we doubt not of their agreeance to it at last; and from thenceforth a fearfull persecution is expected, for the prevalent part of the Episcopall faction are imbittered, and, both in doctrine and practice, it seems, fully of the old Canterburian stamp. God be merciful to our brethren, who hes no help of man, nor any refuge but in God alone: We fear our case shall be little better.'—pp. 484—486.

Baillie did not long survive the penning of this letter. He died in August, 1662, having just foreseen the evil which was coming on his country, but being mercifully spared from the sufferings which many of his brethren were destined to endure.

Of the edition of his *Letters and Journals* now before us, we have already spoken in terms of well-merited eulogy. It comprises all which can be desired, either by the admirers of Baillie or the student of British history. To an extended *Appendix*, consisting of original letters and papers, illustrative of ecclesiastical affairs, it adds a copious *Index* and a *Glossary* of obsolete words. The Bannatyne Club has rendered an important service by the publication, which we shall be glad to see imitated by other kindred associations.

Art. IX. *The Quarterly Review for December.* 1842.

As a sermon without a text is but a homily, and the homily, though not the prayer-book, age has passed away, we shall adopt as our text on the present occasion, the following peroration, with which the 'Quarterly Review' closed its December number:—

'We have shown that these Societies (the League and its auxiliaries) set out with a public and fundamental engagement to act by *legal and constitutional means;* but that, on the contrary, all their proceedings have been in the highest degree unconstitutional, and to the common sense of mankind, illegal.

'We have shown that their second fundamental engagement, that *no party political discussion should be allowed at any of their meetings*, has been scandalously violated, and that the language of their speeches and their press has been not merely *violent* and indecent, but incendiary and seditious.

'We have shown that even from the outset, they endeavoured to menace the government and the legislature with the pressure of *physical force*, and that these threats continued with increasing violence till lost at length in the tumult of the actual outbreak which they had provoked.

'We have shown that the *magistrates* who belonged to these societies, instead of maintaining the peace and tranquillity of their respective jurisdictions, were amongst the most prominent and violent promoters of every species of agitation; and that while all of them talked language and promulgated doctrines that endangered the public peace, some of the highest in authority volunteered declarations, which those inclined to disturb the public peace might reasonably consider as promises of, at least, impunity.

'We have shown that the League have spent, according to their own statement, 90,000*l.* in the last year, we know not exactly how, but clearly in furtherance of the unconstitutional, illegal, and dangerous practices which we have detailed.

'We have shown, we think, abundant reason to conclude that the 50,000*l.* which they are now endeavouring to raise, is probably destined to the same, or perhaps still more illegal, unconstitutional, and dangerous practices.

'We have shown that, from first to last, their system has been one of falsehood and deception, from their original fundamental imposture of being the advocates of the *poor*, down to the meaner shifts of calling brutal violence, freedom of discussion, and a subscription for feeding sedition and riot, a fund for education or charity.

'And finally, we hope we have shown that no man of common sense, of any party, if he only adheres to the general principles of the British constitution, can hesitate to pronounce the existence of such associations, raising money, exciting mobs, organized, and to use a term of the same Jacobin origin as their own, *affiliated*, for the avowed purpose of coercing the government and the legislature, can hesitate, we say, to pronounce the existence of such associations disgraceful to our national character, and wholly incompatible either with the internal peace and commercial prosperity of the country, or, in the highest meaning of the words, THE SAFETY OF THE STATE.'

Now, from this array of illatives, one would imagine that the 'Quarterly Review' had gone through a patient and candid analysis of the official acts of the League, from its origin to the close of 1842; that its objects had been clearly collated with the means employed for their attainment; that the arguments and facts adduced by the Leaguers for the repeal of the Corn Laws, had been met by the solid refutation of other facts; and that a philosophical exposure had been made of the fallacies on which the opinions of the repealers are founded. But if any reader of this quotation should take the trouble to examine that remarkable tirade of which it forms the close, what would be his indignation to find that the whole paper was a studied

avoidance of the το μεγίστον of the controversy, and a mere interchange of every term of denunciation and violence that could be culled from the English vocabulary. That such, and such only, is this memorable review of the proceedings of the League, we boldly refer the most prejudiced supporter of the Corn Laws to the article itself in proof.

Whether the Corn Laws are answerable for the present distress of the people, the reviewer does not appear to trouble himself to inquire; equally careless is he of the arguments and facts with which the League enforces the repeal. Questions of machinery are slightly touched upon indeed, for the purpose of reproaching the cotton lords with a desire to produce as much, and as cheaply as they can; but the main stream of the reviewer's rage runs against the *seditious language* of the multifarious speakers of the League. Lord Kinnaird is soundly rated for having declared that the League does not advocate doctrines of civil force. The dissenting ministers, as was to be expected, are loaded with every opprobrious epithet, and are jeered at for having responded to the call of *a* Mr. George Thompson. Every grotesque simile or inept expression that fell from the speakers in the heat of debate; handbills and tracts which the League never published, the random phrases that fell from men most unskilled in public addresses; Lord John Russell and Colonel Thompson, Duffy the Chartist, and Mr. Higginbotham, Danton and Robespierre, the Rebellion, the famine lyric of Dr. Bowring, and Kersall Moor, are a part of the wadding that hide the

——— lean proportions
Of the argument———

of the 'Quarterly Review.'

The horror, feigned or real, which has been professed at the language employed by some of the Leaguers, appears to us both unphilosophical and absurd. We are no advocates of intemperate language, neither do we admire the nerveless periods with which honourable and right honourable speakers treat the unparalleled distress of the kingdom. It is disgusting to read the unemphatic phrases which are the current terminology of parliament when a famished and pauperized people are the theme; and which afford a marvellous contrast to the violence of aristocratic diction when denouncing the sentiments of the people in the terms *sedition*, *insubordination*, *brutish*, and *revolutionary*, &c. The people complain of these extremes of language in parliament, and in our opinion justly: for when the glaring and countless wrongs of the nation are mentioned, it is in the civil style of the merest common place; but if the demands of the masses for redress are started, the cold and colourless phrases of

aristocratic oration are changed into big and pompous phraseology, where the standing forms of expression, 'the honour and dignity of the crown,' 'the glory of the constitution,' &c., roll forth in gallant volubility amidst the cheers of the House.

Most of the speakers at the meetings of the League are fresh men, forced by the power of distress into the unwonted post of public speakers: they have not been hackneyed into that circumlocutory style in which the atoms of truth are lost in the whirl of complimentary and no-meaning paragraphs. They call things by their right names, and speak strongly from stout and burdened hearts that would have burst long ago but for the vast amount of public virtue that yet, thanks be to God, dwells in the national mind, a far more salient restraint than all the statutes and the military force with which they are backed. Such a style is not only natural to the speakers, but is the best: it wings the thoughts to every man's bosom; whereas, the courtly and classical phrase that is popular in parliament, is little better than so much Greek to the masses. The League speakers only imitate their parliamentary superiors, who speak strongly enough where they feel their interests at stake, and are neither chary of their 'detestation and scorn,' nor of their 'horror and disgust,' when they refer to sentiments that tend to open the eyes of the sufferers to their own affairs. *Strong, and very strong* language, we admit, has been applied by the advocates of free trade to the Corn Laws and their upholders; *but not more strong than much of the aristocratic phrase which has been employed to denounce almost every popular measure that has been wrung from parliament.* Language is of necessity plus or minus, as the mind of the speaker; and as there are many exceptions, among the members of parliament, to the intemperate style of Brougham, Exeter, Lyndhurst, Sibthorpe, Ferrand, Roebuck, *cum multis aliis*, so are there among the speakers of the Anti-Corn Law League. But we neither blame the strong language of aristocratic nor of plebeian speakers, provided it is not a breach of the personal civilities due to all men. Really intemperate language seldom does public harm, but recoils as a punishment on its author. Yet it is to the strong, and not to the toothless style of speech that the world owes all its progressions. The first orators of all times and countries live in the iron monuments of their own style, while the waxen race of elegant declaimers melts from the world, and is justly forgotten.

We quite concur with our wrathful contemporary, that the language of the Anti-Corn Law League is both extraordinary and vehement: alike potent in its sway of the public mind, and prognostic of coming events. Epithets are applied by the speakers of the League, both to their opponents and to the

different *gravamina* of the Corn Law, which we would rather had been spared; but our defence of the terminology of the repealers must be sought in the magnitude of the legislative crimes they denounce, and in the appalling scenes of incipient famine which they portray. If the authors and orators in the service of the League are to speak the words of truth and soberness, their phraseology, however measured, *must* be thoroughly impassioned; for what other would embody the truths that are to be told on this subject, and the facts that 'swell to heaven'? On the authority of committees of parliament, the Corn Laws compel the people of Great Britain to pay 50,000,000*l.* per annum more for their food than they need do; and this sum levied as a monopoly instead of a duty, flows into the pockets of the landlords. Now would any more adequate word than *plunder* convey a just idea of this wholesale system of wrongful acquisition of the popular wealth? Would impolicy or unjust gain, would oppression, or even tyranny, be terms adequately representative of the facts? We maintain, not; and the best style of expounding public evils is to call things by their right names, the more especially as the masses are persons who understand this style, and to whom the modes of subdued expression current among unemphatic and heartless aristocratic speakers must be pure mystery.

The ministers of religion proclaim through the land the retrograde morality of the people, induced by the extreme poverty consequent on the ruin of trade. Would soft terms, and gentle insinuations become the servants of the most high God in such a crisis? One part of the people are passing into the poor-house; another, into the police courts or the grave; a third, into foreign countries; while capital is wasted by millions, and the middle classes are falling into rapid decay; places of worship, with their schools, are half deserted; the cottages of the poor are ransacked by distraint, and our small bankrupt courts are crowded with debtors, yet we are gravely taunted with the vehement language of the sufferers and their friends! Out upon such heartless *finesse*. To this shrouding of the truth by softly flowing oratory much of the mischief is attributable, and certainly the long continuance of the odious tyranny of these Corn Laws.

But the violent declamations of the aristocracy against the violent language of the Leaguers, involves more than a question of taste. The *de gustibus non disputandum* rule, applied even to such styles as those of Lord Ellenborough, Dr. Chalmers, Coleridge, or Edward Irving, soon disposes of the extreme anomalies of individual taste; and the same rule, with a grain of candour, would be amply sufficient to settle the question of style peculiar to the antagonists of the Corn Law. But

this language is power; and with its exercise the 'Quarterly' labours to connect the late strike in the Northern counties, though in so doing it refutes its own fallacies. Language is but 'the outward and visible sign of thought, and it is as impossible to speak in a style like the cold but beautiful crystals of frost when the soul is on fire, as it would be for a man to make his shadow different from himself. Strong language is not only natural, but politic; all revolutions owe to it their being and fashion. Oratory and poetry are but variations of strong language. Every man, not excepting even this reviewer, uses it to the best of his ability when he has any great interest at stake; and the lover, the felon, and the premier, are no fonder of vapid terminology than the democratic speaker; nay, even the philosopher uses the strongest language when he writes on a subject for which he cares a straw. It is only when we advocate the cause in which we have no interest, or of the importance of which we are but half convinced, that nature permits us to waive the use of strong terms.

The National Anti-Corn Law League, as all parties must confess, is a very extraordinary confederacy. It owes its existence to no political party—it exists and grows in spite of their opposition. It is the creature of commerce alone. Its first publications were thought no better than trash; its first meetings had scarcely a locality; its first members were unknown beyond their towns, and even there were thought to be little better than a club of humane enthusiasts, revelling in visions of an era that was thought not even potential, and, if practicable, not to be wished for. Its data were supposed to be too recondite for the multitude, who might occasionally hear of its tea parties and speeches, but who took less interest in such scenes than in the ribboned procession of a St. Patrick's day. At some of these almost unknown meetings, a young man of quiet demeanour occasionally made speeches, which struck the more sagacious as happy specimens of clear-headed argument; but nothing further was then thought of Richard Cobden, who is now at the head of a vast organization of public opinion, which has covered the land with its lecturers and tracts, and divides, with the Parliament of Great Britain, the attention of millions. Such is the power of a truth and the progress of an opinion!

The League *is*, in truth, the rival of the English parliament, and represents more truly the wealth, the intellect, the numbers, the interests of commerce, religion, and education, than either of the legislative houses, which may well feel jealous of its existence. The parliament represents the spirit of aristocracy. It is, with few exceptions, composed of men who have never worked for their living; they are full, and have need of nothing, except the heart of nature's nobility. They have no sympathy with

the democratic world; their universe is one of court days, feudal halls, sumptuous picture-galleries, dinner-parties, and race-courses; and watering-places, titles, and every inane species of barbaric insignia, seem to be the scope of their being. They trace their dignities to savage barons and belted knights; they enjoy a monopoly of royal favours, of places, and pensions, and patronage; they infinitely admire the things of the past, but look with fear upon that onward progress of society to which all their sympathies are alien. The League boasts of no antiquity; it is the gourd that has sprung up in a night for the protection and comfort of the scorched and wasted children of sorrow; it is backed by no laws of parliament; it has not even a sentinel to do duty before its Patagonian Halls; it has neither vergers nor black rod men, nor mace, nor club-houses, nor offices of emolument to prevent the zeal of its members from flagging. It neither promises itself perpetuity, nor proposes to become 'a fifth estate.' It owns itself to be ephemeral, the child of the day, and proposes its own dissolution the day the Corn Laws are blotted from the statutes, *and before this nothing, except its own folly, can destroy it.*

As different as the belligerent parties in parliament, so are their leaders. Mr. Cobden and Sir Robert Peel, though both new men, and risen from the multitude, have met a strange obliquity of destiny; the son of the farmer becoming the champion of free trade, while the polished heir of a cotton spinner, who derived his fortune from trade, passes to the head of the monopolists of land. What a humiliating sight to the noble and ancient houses of Derby, Lansdowne, Spencer, Warwick, Wentworth, Stafford, &c. &c., that the captaincy of the great pitched battle between the interests of oligarchy and those of the people who live by trade should fall into such hands; another added to the countless proofs of the intellectual poverty of aristocracy, whose vaunted *natale numen* and education do not produce the incentive to genius with which trade anoints from her impartial cornucopia the heads of her toiling masses. Cobden, destitute of the personal exterior that ministered so much to the oratory of Chatham, Burke, and Fox, has one of the least impassioned styles. He is earnest, but not intense, simple as childhood, but never dull; straightforward, but never vulgar; he abounds in the *argumentum ad hominem et ex concesso*, but is never vituperative; never subtle, but always acute; at no time profound, but always sagacious; more bullied than any, except O'Connell, but never worsted in the parry; inexhaustible in quotation of well-proved facts which appeal to the common judge in every man's bosom, and indomitably true to their legitimate induction. He derives none of his power from the influence

of the landlord, or from great property acquired by trade. With such a lack of what has always been thought indispensable to party success, Mr. Cobden has yet risen, in two or three sessions, to contest the championship with the premier, experienced in parliamentary tactics for thirty years; and he represents more fairly the sentiments of a greater number of her Majesty's subjects than perhaps any other member of parliament.

How different is Sir Robert Peel! To the influence of great wealth, he unites that of a polished speaker, fertile in quotation and lampoon; of studied exterior, backed by the desperate host of oligarchs; a perfect Claudio in the plausibles; a master of the wriggling argument, exquisitely polished even to the little end of nothing; *au fait* in all the secrets of court and ministerial shuffle, prompt at clap trap, proud of being thought impartial, punctilious in preserving the forms of the house, weathered in all its climates, familiar with every offset to the popular cause, and honoured by four monarchs. Sir Robert Peel has been fondled at the feet of the great lions of despotism, the familiar of dukes and marquesses, curtseyed to by their ladies, petted by the parsons, noticed by foreign potentates, quoted as an authority of taste, the mender of criminal codes and currency bills, the patron of many that are now high at the bar and the church, the Divus Dis, in his silver armour, always awake, but always reserved; several times premier before, while once the nation had to halt till he had galloped from Rome! Yet what a stripling he proves himself beside Richard Cobden!

This difficulty, however, might be borne awhile, if it were not for a greater, and one created by the premier himself. What is he to do with his own principle of buying in the cheapest and selling in the dearest market? It is too plain to be withstood, and too brief to be mystified. It is too simple to be treated as a metaphor, and was uttered on too grave an occasion to have been the *lapsus loquendi* of a heated debater. Explanation it neither wants nor admits, for while such was the text of the premier, his correspondent paraphrase of the tariff avenges the sense. What is good for the goslings must be better for the geese. The same principle, if good, in a few applications, must be better as it is amplified, and best only when it has been equitably and fairly carried to its full consequences. This is all that free trade demands, and it quotes no author so apt as Sir Robert Peel. 'This gentleman will be judged by his peers;' he owns no authority but himself; we are content, and relinquish all others, if he will abide by his own words. What will the premier then do? Recede he cannot, nor stand still. The principle of buying in the cheapest and selling in the dearest market is one

of progression; and therefore equally adapted to the laws of mental development and the wants of society. A hundred years hence, commerce will rejoice in the maxim, while it is clear that the history of trade is nothing more than a pursuit of advantage under the guidance of this one rule.

The *Causes* of these remarkable men are equally dissimilar. That of monopoly depends on the infinitely-tangled lacework of private interest; it appeals to no higher morality than Acts of Parliament; it calls the glittering tenants of the West End, the people of England; and it depends alone on the army and the majority of the House of Commons. It prates of terror and love of change, and quotes the extravagances of our Commonwealth and the Revolution of France. It is admirable at the use of the *cum hoc, ergo propter hoc* style of argument, and insists on the glory which England has acquired under the present system. It makes gorgon heads of possible times of dearth, and reckons the casualty of 'all the world conspiring to starve England,' a sufficient reason, against the repeal. It talks of the immoral tendency of the manufacturing system, and dotes through tears of admiration on a virtuous yeomanry who do not exist, and on a peaceable peasantry who rejoice in potatoes. But it *never appeals to common sense nor Scripture;* it quotes no facts to prove its theory, and reposes with sleek apathy in the resolve—*nolumus leges Angliæ mutare.*

The cause of the League may be expressed in the sinewy phrase of Knox, "*the immutabel righteousnesse offe the invincibil Godde:*" for we regard the abstract principle of right and wrong on which the opposition to the Corn Laws is based, to be the true secret of its strength. Next to the abstract justice part of the question, comes the appeal to mercy; an auxiliary worthy of the principal motive for entire repeal of the taxes on food. And if anything more were necessary to enforce justice on a selfish body of legislators who have no more sympathy with the masses of the people than with the marauding desperadoes of Hyderabad, it is to be found in the unanswerable array of facts and figures, which committees of the House of Commons and committees of the League have unwittingly united to pour upon the nation. But the resources of the League are not even thus exhausted: the demand for repeal has risen from the quiet warning of a few philosophical economists to become the *vox populi*, troubling every debate in Parliament, and producing a stronger spirit of inquiry and disaffection than will coalesce with things as they are. The League has all the elements of strength which can be derived from wealth, intelligence, numbers, and popular interest; it is the *ingens horrendum* to monopoly, without the *cui lumen ademptum.*

We repeat, the League is all juvenescence, stalwart in limb, capacious of action, unencumbered with frivolities, undaunted of purpose, and exhaustless in its power of peaceable agitation. Every new insolvent or unemployed artisan becomes a convert to its doctrines, if he were not one before. The philosopher approves of it in his study; the preacher blesses it from the pulpit; "the hungry, and faint, and poor," look to it for temporal salvation, and nothing can stop its course but the entire repeal of the Corn Laws. Something was, however, wanted to propel the streams of the League with more effect through a certain portion of the public mind; and that propellant force has been timely given by Sir Robert Peel's assault on Mr. Cobden; and this gentleman and the League can afford to pocket the affront, and to take the premier's opportune aid as his subscription to the 50,000*l.* fund.

Of the incident to which we refer we have little to say. There can be no doubt that it was a mere enaction, dashed with something more of the adventure style than is common to 'the responsible adviser of her Majesty.' It was partly voluntary, and partly in pursuance of the scheme of diversion commenced by Ferrand in the early part of last session, but matured to greater ripeness by the seventy pages issued in December by the 'Quarterly Review.' If Mr. Cobden could be crushed, other advocates might perhaps be coaxed; at all events, it was worth the trial. A faint heart

'Ne'er won a ladie fayre,'

But what are we to think of the conduct of a portion of the daily press, which lent itself to the base partisanship of the monopolist, and but faintly repelled the slanderers of the League? What becomes of the long-vaunted liberty of the press, if its pages can be thus easily obtained for the service of faction? The premier, in a fit of spleen, fell rabidly on Mr. Cobden for reminding him of his responsibility: and the press ought to have echoed that doctrine through the length and breadth of the land. Instead of doing this, however, it assaulted the Rev. Mr. Bayley for quoting an anecdote as *a sign of the times;* and endeavoured, from Mr. Cobden's honourable refusal to repudiate Mr. Bayley, to establish a complicity between these two gentlemen and the murderous madman M'Naughton; a species of logic similar to that of the satirist who attempted to prove that because butter was not salt, therefore it must be gunpowder! By all means let the monopolists renew the assault on the League and its friends; nothing can be more opportune for its funds, lectures, facts, and appeals. To Sir Robert Peel, Mr. Cobden may say, in the words of Bobadino, 'Please your honour

to abuse us roundly once a week, it is better than the gift of a thousand florins:' and if the premier should reply in the words of his honour, 'I will, Bobadino, for a share of the gain,' Mr. Cobden can afford to strike the bargain.

To the malignant opponents of the Conservative party its position yields no small amount of merriment. It is of Divine arrangement that the sequences of moral actions often follow their agents, even in the present life. To punish a selfish course of legislation, from this law, has arisen the League, from which it will require more skill and mortification to escape than it would have done to have acted justly at first. The League is the child of the Corn Laws; hampered by the force without, which this doughty offspring has raised against its parent, and baffled within Parliament by its cause and appeals, what can the monopolists do? The 'Quarterly Review' has sported seventy pages to prove that the acts of the League are seditious, and its constitution illegal. Why, then, in the name of common sense not suppress it?

'"Tis a consummation devoutly to be wished!'

If unconstitutional, by all means suppress it. But who shall 'cast the first stone?' Is no Curtius to be found among the senators? Is there no genius of the *Dewsbury Devil order* in the Lords who will go to the rescue of lachrymose monopoly? Let a call of the House be made, and let the lots be given to the Spartans, and it may be, Mammon will overrule the ostracism, when the business will be achieved, and the breath of the oligarchs may again respire unoppressed! But what then? Why, the League, of course, will fall like a bed of tulips in a thunder storm! Cobden will creep back to his factory, and the tons of Corn Law speeches and tracts will be sold to the hucksters to wrap up soap, and candles, and blue. The perspective is all sunshine afterwards; by all means, therefore, suppress the League.

But what if our vaticinations should fail? Let the remedy be tried, and brave hearts task themselves to the height of the maxim—

'Dii sua bona laboribus vendunt.'

It may be, however, in this 'life of hazard,' that the escapade against the League might fail; that Hydra, as one head was destroyed, might raise a hundred to avenge the affront done to its shoulders. It is possible that if the League were suppressed at Manchester, another would start up in Liverpool, a second in Glasgow, a third in Bristol, and the οι πολλοι in the other chief towns of the realm, while a metropolitan Briareus might arise

in Palace Yard! 'All things are possible to him that believeth,' and this *might be* the result of suppressing the League. What then? Let us look at the alternative. The League *must* be suppressed or left alone; for Sir Robert Peel has declared his determination at present not to repeal the Corn Laws. The 'Quarterly Review' attributes to the League the late turn-out in Lancashire, and Sir Robert Peel has played Act the first in the 'Bombastes Furioso' in Parliament, to the dismay of his friends and the jeers and indignation of his enemies. Are these things to continue? They must, except he suppress the League. This formidable antagonist collects taxes without an Act of Parliament, builds palaces for its meetings, sends its lecturers into every village, controls a number of periodicals, reads lectures to Conservative landlords in Parliament on the state of their tenants, is blessed by millions every morning, and dilates through every day into new magnitude. The rude and ungentlemanly deportment of the premier to Mr. Cobden acted at once as a safety valve to his own heart, and as inspiration to that of millions of her Majesty's subjects, who respond to the scene of cajolery, by addresses to Mr. Cobden. The prying finger of the League has at length detected the gangrenous spot that cannot bear even the touch of 'a Sussex farmer's son.' The Doctor *must*, however, and *will* examine that part again, at whatever cost to the feelings of the sufferer. What can avert the question of responsibility, but the suppression of the League, or the repeal of the Corn Laws? We have often enough been flouted with the phrase, 'the responsible advisers of the Crown.' To whom are they, then, responsible?—the Crown only? But the Crown itself is responsible both by the law of nature and by the constitution, to the people, or the compact between Sovereign and subjects is the most insolent farce ever trumped up to juggle a cheated people. The League, then, preaches the orthodoxy of the constitution, and it must continue to expound the doctrine, except it be suppressed.

Nor does the League wish for the removal, at least, it ought not, of the premier from office; for he has certainly done more to expedite the ultimate freedom of trade from the chains of the aristocracy, than any prime minister selected from the Whigs could have done. Whether he be at heart a free-trader, and from policy remains within the aristocratic circle, to warm and expand its atmosphere, or whether impelled solely by his convictions of commercial truth, he utters them, blind or reckless of the consequences, it is certain that he has enunciated doctrines which will never coalesce with the retention of the Corn Laws. The same sentiments uttered by Lord Russell might

have been received with cold assent, if not with jeers, while the thoughtless majority in Parliament now applaud the truth that we must buy in the cheapest, and sell in the dearest market, *as if the orthodox sentiment* should be accepted by the people as a substitute for the repeal. The Leaguers and the premier are agreed upon the axioms; by all means, then, let him continue in office, and be forced to the *quod* erit *demonstrandum*, or the repeal of the Corn Laws.

Sir Robert Peel is a marvellous man; a polished 'Simon Little' in himself, he is yet the keeper of all the magnates of the Conservative cause, who are almost as invisible in his presence, as the moons of Jupiter at noon. Where is my Lord Stanley, the Hotspur of former fields? The Chancellor of the Exchequer might be no more, for the little that is seen or even heard of him, except when in some squabble, he appears at the magistrate's office to swear his life against a discarded subaltern! The great Captain himself is sunk to a secondary—a sort of gentleman-lackey of the Cabinet. Lord Lyndhurst has not even cracked a cap. The gay and agile riflemen of former days—where are they? The fusileers and sappers, the scouts and foragemen of the Conservative party in Parliament—where are they? Sir Robert Peel might have eaten them all up, and rejoicing in the various gifts imparted by such aliment, thus account for his sustaining the war single-handed, and doing at once the work of miner, gunner, corporal, fifer, and gibbeteer. By what lullaby has he hushed these dearies to slumber? and from what narcotic do they sleep so soundly and so long? Perhaps not an egotist naturally, his position makes him appear superlatively so. 'The curve line,' said Hogarth, 'is the test of beauty,' and so said Baldini of the straight line, to which we rather incline in political matters,—for all things begin, continue, and close with the premier in the mighty I, reminding one of the old ditty—

> 'I, by myself, I,
> Can talk to the little fly,
> Speak to the lavrac that he hie,
> Cause matrons waste and maidens die,
> Teach knights to fight, or hounds to lie,
> Or spoor your dreams and tell you why,
> Drive death off, or bring him nigh,
> I, by myself, I.'

Such is the potent versatility of the premier's genius. He is the valorous all-in-all of the Cabinet, and the more wonderful is his all-present activity when we remember that he sustains the burden alone, save the occasional services of the renegade Sir James Graham, and the wrath of the member for Bath.

If some of the statements of the 'Quarterly Review' were of

too ribald a character to produce any other effect than to show the ungovernable passion of the writer, the charge made against the League of spending 90,000*l.* in one year, demands a graver reply. The reviewer, aware of the all-potent *argumentum ad denarium*, and of the just and universal scandal that falls on those who misappropriate the public money, affects to compare the expenditure of the League with its income, and tauntingly inquires 'what public proceedings of the League can account for a tithe of the expenditure?' It proceeds to reply. 'We know not, but we know, as everybody knows, that within the specified period there happened two public events in which the League took a great interest—the general election in 1841, and the general turn-out in 1842—and until the League shall give (which never it has done since January 1840) some detailed account of its expenditure, we shall be justified in suspecting that the general election, to say nothing of some separate contests since, and the general turn-out, have had something to do with the disappearance of the 90,000*l.*' These shameless assumptions of the League's income by its enemies are thus refuted by Mr. Cobden:—

'Gross exaggerations have appeared as to the sum of money which has already been spent by the council of the League. About 25,000*l.* is the amount which has passed through our hands during the last four years, of which I think full seven-eighths have been raised in Manchester and the neighbourhood. We calculate that about three times this sum has been expended by the local associations, and by individuals throughout the kingdom, in petitions, printing, deputations, meetings, &c. Or, in round numbers, probably 100,000*l.* may have been expended in the past agitation of the question. You may have observed that the *Standard* newspaper, mistaking the 100,000*l.* mentioned in our address to mean the expenditure of the Manchester Council of the League, has put down its own estimate of our expenditure at 15,000*l.*, and inquires very gravely for the balance.'

As to the appropriation of the income of the League to election purposes, the same gentleman observes, in a letter to the chairman of the Liverpool Association—

'You may have seen, in some of the monopolist papers, accusations made against the League of having paid my election expenses, and those of other free trade candidates. I merely notice it to add a fact. At the memorable contest for Walsall, when our president, Mr. Smith, stood on anti-corn-law principles, in opposition to Mr. Gladstone, an application was made from that borough to the League for pecuniary assistance. An extraordinary general meeting of the council was called, and, at the most numerous meeting ever held, a unanimous vote was passed, refusing the aid, and repudiating the principle of voting any money from the funds of the League for election contests. That resolution has been faithfully adhered to.'

The second insinuation, that the funds of the repealers went to procure the turn-out of 1842 is less deserving of serious reply. An election certainly never occurs without expense, as the subscribers to that Corn Law League, the Carlton Club, know. How many members of parliament, election agents, attorneys, editors, clerks, and justices of the peace, owe to that Catalinian treasury their rise and fall, possibly we shall never know. We offer our contemporary a fair challenge, to furnish, for the next number of the 'Quarterly Review,' every item of the expenditure of the League from its origin, if it will only publish *the expenditure of the Carlton Club for the last three years!* If the challenge be refused, we might urge the *lex talionis* as a justification of the National Anti-Corn Law League not publishing its accounts. But there is no need of secrecy. The world not merely *may*, but will see how the past and future levies of the League are appropriated. But surely no great amount was necessary to produce a strike! The movements of the operative class are generally cheap to the public, as the principal cost of strikes are paid by the minus wages of the operatives. Did the League keep open taverns, or dole out soup, or bread and beer? Did it fee the leaders of the workmen, who have done all they could to embroil its acts with their own indictments? Did not the turn-outs take the side of wages against the Leaguers, whom they were instigated by O'Connor and his partisans to regard as a combination against labour. In what imaginable mode could any part of the alleged 90,000*l.* be expended, either in raising the strike, or conducting its operations, or in putting an end to its alarming movements? The government has been aided by the Chartists in searching for evidence to convict the League of complicity in the strike, yet where are the discoveries? If the power of the League were as all pervading as the 'Quarterly' alleges, it is passing strange that its creature, the multitude, never for a moment acknowledged its sway, but divided forthwith into two different bodies—one claiming the Charter, and the other the fair day's wages! By the ordinary rules of demonology, we are told that he only who raises the ghost can control its motions or allay its ire; but here the law egregiously commits trespass upon itself. The League raises the spirit of sedition, which was no sooner up than it turned its malignant powers on its *invocantes*. Strange neophytes were these 'Russell magistrates,' and not even cunning withal; for against the goblins they had called from the vasty deep 'to coerce the government,' they had not provided for their own safety!

We can tell the 'Quarterly' a secret, however, which may be worth knowing. *The League does know* that the Conservatives have disbursed considerable sums among the Chartist leaders to

effect a diversion of the working-classes, and to keep up the watchword 'The Charter,' against the cause of the repeal.

Even the women of Manchester have not escaped the ire of the reviewer, who is shocked to find 'ladies of title and the wives of merchants,' (who are sneeringly mentioned as the *femelles de ces mâles,*) engaged in a bazaar and a *soirée* on the side of the League. How long and shameless a sinister female influence has swayed in the senate, the church, the camp, and the cabinet, the reviewer does not state; nor was it either necessary or convenient. How many members of parliament, officers of the government, the army and the navy, and even the church, owe almost entirely to lady influence their present position, it is not easy either to record. Many gross instances of this nature are matters of history; but as long as 'the charming plotters' are engaged in the Conservative service, it is but 'the natural operation of uncontrollable causes.' When the ladies became the advocates of the West Indian slaves, and mixed up the question of negro freedom with their love and fire-side affairs, they were assailed, in the same spirit, and by the same division of the press that affects to be 'shocked at the impropriety of the wives and daughters' of Manchester and other great towns becoming the coadjutors of the League. The reviewer's ire proves the value of such auxiliaries; and we hope all 'the wives and daughters' of the Corn Law repealers will take the hint, and at once turn those influences which they only create and wield, to the sacred cause of patriotism and the poor. No right-hearted woman, we are told, ever failed of her purpose; and as the League proposes to coerce the government by raising the greatest power of the country—opinion—against its monopolies, it acts wisely to secure the all penetrating influence of 'the wives and daughters,' who are, at least, as much interested in the question of cheap bread and abundant labour, as the 'lords and sons of the soil.' A protest against political women is sickly nonsense; for, with individual exceptions, there is that in their nature, in all countries and times, which prevents their becoming politicans; but there are certain powers of conquest inalienable in the softer sex, whether they sit

'Simply chatting in a rustic row,'

or, 'winding the distaff,' or, 'teaching the young idea how to shoot,' of which the League does well to avail itself. The only disgrace attaches to the government, that makes resort to such help necessary, by refusing to concede a popular right proved to satiety, and demanded by eight-tenths of the people, and that after a rapid retrogression of commerce for seven years, which has ruined

tens of thousands of the people, and driven others to the gaol, the asylum, or to foreign shores. Women of England! exigencies arose in the states of Sparta, Judea, and Rome, when public virtue turned its saddened eyes to your sex, which more than once saved the national fortunes from the factious folly of their husbands and lords. Your loftier religion, your gentler philanthropy, and your better knowledge, will all aid the succour which you may give in this crisis of the national sufferings to the Anti-Corn-Law League, which proposes to redeem the disheartened labourer from his serfdom to the monopolist, and to cast prodigal and supercilious aristocracy on its own resources.

The 'Quarterly Review' charges the whole animus of the League upon 'the unappeasable greediness of gain.' We do not deny that gain is one of the main motives in the agitation, but if *some* of the subscriptions have sprung from the reckonings of policy, it cannot surely be pretended that the '*unappeasable greediness* of gain' is the motive with the *millions* that oppose the Corn Laws. Ministers and churches innumerable, and distant from the seat of our manufactories, are equally emphatic in their opposition to these nefarious statutes. The influence of the prominent Leaguers, it is confessed, may be great in their localities; but truly it cannot be the reason that there exists, in both Houses of Parliament, among a large proportion of the agriculturists, the shopkeepers in small towns, and the great capitalists in the metropolis, a strong sense of indignation against the existence of this capital monopoly. The love of gain must always be one of the primitive elements of political and commercial life; since it is the main stimulant to enterprise, and the incentive to labour; and, without it, the plough would be as motionless as the shuttle, and the wheels of Printing-house Square would be as still as those of the jenny. But with what audacity is this reproach cast upon the League; for, what but the 'unappeasable greediness of gain' at first originated, and now upholds the Corn Laws? Is it pretended that these laws have been beneficial to a single class beside that of the landlords? Are the poor better fed or clothed, better educated, or more protected in their civil rights since 1815 than they were before? Are the shopkeepers deriving a better trade from the existence of the Corn Laws? Nay, are the agriculturists themselves enriched by their operation? Are not the labourers on the land quite as immoral, much less intelligent, and inconceivably worse fed and clothed than 'the serfs of the cotton lords'? And, if it be alleged that prices have been maintained by the operation of these laws on all agricultural produce, how does the 'Quarterly Review' deal with the withering fact that the wages of prædial labour have been on the rapid subsidence, and are now at a disgraceful ratio beneath the lowest notions of remuneration?

The 'Quarterly' labours earnestly to trace much of the power of the League to the 'Russell magistrates.' The Chartist Frost is compared with Sir J. Potter and others who are in the commission of the peace, but opposed to the Corn Laws. Lord Russell is soundly belaboured by the reviewer for having appointed none but opponents of the Corn Law to the commission of the peace; and yet, almost in the same page, he is taunted with being himself an advocate of the Corn Laws, and with having only at the eleventh hour resorted to the scheme of a fixed duty to keep his place! Passion is not only mad, but mendacious; and we need cite no other proof, and could cite no better, than 'the ephemeral spawn' of the reviewer himself. If Lord Russell and the Whig ministers were really the friends of the Corn Law, is it imaginable that they who have been repeatedly charged with the old sacerdotal sin of 'refusing even to open or shut the doors for naught,' should yet have chosen three-fourths of their magistrates from the advocates of the League, and particularly in the localities of Lancashire and Yorkshire, where such an election would be prejudicial to the Whig ministry in the highest degree. The reviewer calculates on the intellectual laziness of his readers, of which he has received for years both the profit and the proof. The Conservatives have been so accustomed to have all the officials of the kingdom bending one way

'their precious influence,'

that it is intolerable to see a few knights and justices of the peace, at last, among the friends of the people. Long-continued custom is generally, by shallow apologists of usage, easily confounded with right; and wills that have long been practised to command find it hard indeed to obey. The aristocracy who have monopolized every ray of power, have only had 'to speak and it was done;' and now that the lion of popular strength has roused himself, and roars, from his lair, warnings of resolute action, the asses that have pranced and yawed with toleration in his presence, affect indignation that he should disturb their pastimes. There are fictitious influences enough, we are aware, in the petty distinctions of life, to stagger the frail virtue of our nature; and if the maintenance of the Corn Laws had not been a grievance of the coarsest nature, the Sir Thomases, and Sir Ralphs, and the Aldermen of Stockport, Leeds, and Manchester, would have been quiet enough. The fact of their joining such a body as the League, which commits them to fellowship with men unknown to fortune and to fame, the churchman with the dissenter, the devout with the sceptic, and occasionally the tory with the radical, is proof enough that the cause of their union must be one of no ordinary grievance. Nothing less could have procured such a coalition of all tastes and parties, who have

little in common but their resolution to overthrow the Corn Laws—in which work, Providence, poverty, and time, those ancient allies of suffering virtue, are now in active co-operation. If, however, the League did not muster a knight, a peer, a magistrate, or an alderman, the Corn Laws must fall. Arrayed against them, in strong confederacy, are the 1,500,000 paupers, the loves and chat of women, the prayers of the devout, the power of the voluntary pulpit, and the nameless *et cetera* that start every day some new spring into the power of the League.

The attempt on the part of the reviewer to affix upon the magistrates of Manchester the odium of having coaxed the outbreak into being, and of having petted its countless hordes in their strange itinerations through the clothing districts, is worthy of his faction. Coercion of opinion as long as it will work, and criminal informations when it fails, are all the policy of which Conservative reviewers dream. Voluntary reform of abuses, and opportune concession of popular rights, are in its diction, 'hypocritical cant and rabid faction.' These 'Russell magistrates' reflected infinite honour on their commission of the peace, in having warned the government *publicly*, and not as spies, of a probable outbreak; and not the less so in throwing upon the government the responsibility of the *incentive* causes of the disturbance. The clerical creatures and squires that would have galloped at the head of Dragoons, with drawn sabres, among the multitude, slaughtering the innocent and hanging the leaders at the next lamp-post, would, we are aware, have better comported with the reviewer's notions of a justice of the peace;' and if 'the Russell magistrates' had played over again the scenes of Peterloo, and put themselves into valorous obsequience to Sir James Graham, the Horse Guards, and the commissioners of police, doubtless they would have figured in the 'Quarterly Review' as gentlemen of honourable sentiments.

Lord Brougham is one of that class of men, who, if true in the main to the cause of the people, would have escaped retaliation for a score of minor offences against prudence or taste; for his undoubted powers would have melted criticism into a mixture of admiration and lenity. His former services would have pleaded against rigorous exaction for present faults; and the hope that his Quixotism arose more from the frolic of genius than from a depravation of principle, would have stayed the *ultionis ictus;* and thus he might have masqueraded through the House of Peers, with the licence of the lord of misrule, if it had been felt that he remained the friend of the people, who could scarcely expect entire freedom from his scorpion tongue. Let jokes go free, by all means; and we shall always protest against the Lilliputs and the farthingalers becoming the appraisers of our great men.

But are Lord Brougham's sins against the cause of the people of the jest class? or are they the mere whimsicalities of a genius, wanton in the consciousness of its power to retrieve in an hour the sports of a week? No; his lordship's offences are of graver dye; for during nearly the whole of his time in the upper house, he has shamefully squandered the great influence with which he rose to the woolsack, and abused the confidence which the friends of the popular cause had fain reposed in Henry Brougham.

We do not assert that there is a compact between the ex-Chancellor and the friends of monopoly, that he should delude the popular advocates by occasional ardour in their cause. But if he had been hired to exert himself to the utmost on the side of the Tories, abating the formal renunciation of his former principles, he could not have done more than he has done to make himself neutral in the cause to which he owes much of his fortune and all his honours. His attacks on the League are as rancorous as those of Ferrand, though more oblique; but his lordship is deceived if he imagines the public are misled by his repudiation of some of its men, and his praise of others, and by his very occasional advocacy of the *abstract doctrines* of free trade. The Anti-Corn Law leaders have shown their sagacity in never reposing their confidence in Lord Brougham; and *we imagine that it is to this fact* all his chagrin is attributable. About four years ago, some persons connected with the League were desirous of making overtures to his lordship in a vote of thanks; this was very properly opposed; a slight skirmish ensued, which became public, and as the circumstance had evidently galled his lordship, he addressed an angry letter to the Leaguers, who, however, neither apologised nor relaxed their determination to keep clear of the quagmire on which the League would have stood if it had chosen Lord Brougham for its champion. There is, we also suspect, another ground of unconfessed grievance. The League has always reposed confidence in O'Connell, and has at all times received his honest support with gratitude; nor has it been niggard of its confidence and praise to 'the best abused man of his age,' and who, from intellectual, as well as other causes, is at heart hated by Lord Brougham. Some truths can never be proved, and yet no one feels the less confidence in their certainty; and this is one of the class. Lord Brougham's nature prepares him for the *omne aut nil*, and his history proves with what rigour he uses the maxim. The League did not consign its championship to a man who, by one speech as a friend, might have baffled the preparations of years, which, as an enemy, he would not have injured. As a secondary, this nobleman is stifled; for his volition becomes paralytic, even in the best of

causes, where his personal gratification is not made the *end*, and the public good the pander to the orator. Had the precious and perilous interests of this glorious agitation against the well-organized powers of monopoly been committed to a man whose intellect was liable to be driven from its course by a hundred gusts of passion, and whose heart has never shown its possession of the greater attributes of philanthropy, the friends of the people might long before this have had reason to reproach their own credulity, and to bewail the results of their misplaced confidence We repeat *advisedly*, the League has not courted Lord Brougham; and it is to the faint praise with which they have responded to his occasional sallies against the monopolists, that his lordship's attack on the League, through Mr. Bayley, is mainly attributable.

To Lord Brougham's power, and his former services to the people, we have always paid willing homage; and would rather see him 'come to himself' than continue the discarded pantaloon of the aristocratic wardrobe. He can never attain to the confidence of the nobles, who plainly use him, as some have done O'Connor, to do the service which none but the scout can effect. At what time the name of Henry Brougham was quoted with admiration in every poor man's house, at the plough, in the tavern, and the school, by the oppressed colonist, the merchant at his counter, and by the weaver at his loom, did he 'lick the aristocratic hand that has purloined him from himself'? Would he in those days, 'in season and out of season,' have sprung to his feet to pour fulsome compliments on such weathered opponents of liberty as the Duke of Wellington? Would he then have lavished ever and anon paragraphs of gross adulation on such renegades as Lyndhurst and Graham; or have become the apologist of such men as Sir Robert Peel and Lord Wharncliffe? Would he have gone 'infinite leagues' out of his way to reach such men as Mr. Bayley, especially when he knew that his attack would only injure the cause of popular liberty? No; if there had been no other reasons for withholding praise from enemies, lest the accident of his generosity should by weak persons be mistaken for the major of his purpose, Lord Brougham, when he had his fortune and honours to acquire, had prudence sufficient to have been chary of his praise. But he has now acquired all that a subject can obtain, without losing the ambition to be chief; and perhaps destitute of the courage requisite for formal apostasy, or faintly restrained by the last abraded link of public virtue, with no chance of again becoming the popular champion, he has embraced the only distinction left, that of becoming marplot, which leaves him the liberty of both 'envying Judah and of vexing Israel'—an admirable position, if his lordship

be not covenanted to the Conservatives! Bound by no principles, attached to no body of men, aiming at no public objects, how independent must he feel! Irresponsible in his position, and unlimited in his licence of speech, he can now lampoon the virtuous, or satirize the sufferer, or do genuflexion to the oppressor without fear of the electors at York, or the results of the canvass. Has his lordship ever seriously turned his eyes upon himself within the last ten years? When he does, we may assure him, that without one of Dee's stones he will see the indignant ghost of Henry Brougham sternly challenging the peer to

'Look on this picture and on that,'

or perhaps more finely appealing to its lordly tenement,

'Is this the region, this the clime?' &c.

Lord Brougham is evidently ill at ease; he has frolicked away the autumn of his life with the *Roebucks* and 'wild asses of the desert,' till he is no longer taken for one of the lions; his equals discard, his victims jeer him, and at his occasional roar the ass yaws, and the veriest curs bark disdain. Children play with the faint smoke, and mock the rumbling of the *spent* volcano.

But we must notice Lord Brougham's attack on the Rev. Mr. Bayley, of Sheffield; the more so, since, though that gentleman has fully explained his meaning in *quoting the anecdote* "of the hundred lots," his lordship has recently had the unmanliness to add insult to outrage, by again talking of "the assassination speeches of a Yorkshire clergyman." It is very remarkable, that no other parts of Mr. Bayley's speeches have been charged with violence but his *narrative of the two anecdotes;* and, with these exceptions, he certainly has not uttered anything approaching to the vehemence of many of the other speakers at the meetings of the League. Now, with all deference to some of our contemporaries, we cannot see why, *if such were* the state of feeling in any part of the country,—and no man knows better than Lord Brougham in what language famine, beggary, and pauperism express themselvs,—where was the harm of quoting, *as an evidence* of the state of *a part* of the public feeling, words which the speaker had heard, and which, we are sure, are far from being confined to Yorkshire? No one who knows Mr. Bayley could suspect him any more than Mr. Cobden of advocating that which, if advocated, however remotely, would lead to the dissolution of the social compact, and to the highest breach of the divine commands. Mr. Bayley is known to have been for several years the advocate of the doctrine, that it is unlawful to deprive men of life, even for the gravest of crimes. To suppose him, therefore, capable of advocating contrary doctrines against innocent men is perfectly absurd; and the absurdity was only

exceeded by the wickedness of endeavouring to connect the relation of the anecdote with the crime of M'Naughten: with how much justice, the event of the trial has proved. If Lord Brougham had made an attack on Mr. Bayley fairly, *out of his place* in parliament, and given him a chance of appealing to a jury of his countrymen to adjudge the slanderer, it would have been more decent, if no less wicked. As it is, his lordship may thank himself for Mr. Bayley's letter to him. Long may he enjoy the honour of the *cognomen* which the indignant writer has fixed on his noble assailant!

We cannot conclude without expressing our heartfelt sorrow at the present position of the government and the people. We are now happily spared the trouble of proving the public distress. It is judged of all; the clodpoles have conned the lesson till they have it by rote, and their very kine low in tones of sympathy with the manufacturing towns. Yet what does the government propose as a remedy? Why, it proposes to mend the drainages, and to compel the people whom it has pauperised to keep their dung-heaps more neatly, and more scientifically to ventilate their pig-sty! This reminds us of a certain period in the history of Rome, when all classes appeared to be seized with a fervid desire for reform. The forum was crowded with zealots; the tablets were hung upon the walls, covered with notices of new laws; sumptuary laws were in preparation to restrain the number of peacocks that should be eaten, or to regulate when diamonds liquefied might be quaffed by favourite and dainty ladies; but after the inhabitants had enjoyed the delights of good purpose, the reforms dwindled into a slight improvement of the sewers near the Appian Way! When the people are in want of bread, Sir Robert Peel is projecting an improved method of keeping the manure! When the mills are silent, and the artisans are tramping the streets in wooden shoes, the only thing that the government appears to be earnest about is, 'the privileges of the House,' and a new method of providing for the superfluity of clergymen—by building more churches for some, and by thrusting others into superintendencies of parish and factory schools. The aristocracy have objected to the repeal of the Corn Laws, the peculiar burdens of the land! Mr. Ward brings in a motion to inquire into these peculiar burdens, and the House refuses the inquiry! The premier declares, that all people should buy in the cheapest and sell in the dearest market, and yet the law that compels us to *buy* in the dearest and *sell* in the cheapest market he refuses to repeal! Is it wonderful that the aristocracy should be despised, and that Sir Robert Peel in particular should be the object of contempt? We confess it would be a miracle, indeed, if it were otherwise.

It is, no doubt, 'the unappeasable greediness of gain' alone that accounts for the reluctance of parliament to repeal, as it was from it that the Corn Laws were first imposed. How melancholy to the lover of his country must be the inference to which we are thus driven! This comes of the apathy with which the public have regarded the morals of government; which, even more than the taxes, ought to be most vigilantly observed. Instances of private persons sacrificing principle to lucre are to be expected, and, in one sense, may be easily pardoned; but the crime of avarice culminates only when the progress of legislation is made to wait upon Mammon. The avarice of governments has not the plea of necessity which individuals are wont to interpose. All governments can afford to practise the most abstract morality, and men will never be well governed till they look better to the morality of their rulers. Nay, if the repeal of the Corn Laws would be a certain national loss, still, as their existence is a violation of the plainest obligations of right, both human and divine, their repeal ought to be instantaneous and entire; and what was the nation's loss could be easily borne.

Until the Corn Laws are repealed, however, the government —that cannot, if it dared, and dare not, if it could, suppress the League—must take all the consequences of the mighty agitation with which it fills the land. The wheel of the mill troubles the water vastly beyond the fall of its diameter; and as long as the wheel is in motion, nothing can prevent the surrounding agitation. The public grievances are all concatenated; and while the League is ceaselessly at work to destroy the master-link of monopoly's chain, all the lesser parts must vibrate to the shock. Complete suffrage, annual parliaments, &c., receive no small collateral aid from the operations of the League, though it neither enforces these doctrines nor directly abets their disciples. But when the baffled people shall once arrive at the conviction that they will not get the instalment of the Corn Laws, they will simultaneously drop the demand, and require the whole debt from the men that have long mocked their arguments and jested with their tears.

THE

ECLECTIC REVIEW

For MAY, 1843.

Art. I. 1. *Du Pape, par le Comte Joseph de Maistre.* Nouvelle edition. Paris, 1841.

On the Pope. By Count Joseph de Maistre.

2. *Les Soirees de St. Petersbourg, ou Entretiens sur le gouvernement Temporel de la Providence.* Nouvelle edition. Bruxelles, 1839.

The Evenings of St. Petersburg; or, Conversations on the Temporal Government of Providence. By the same Author.

The Roman-catholic re-action which is now manifesting itself with a daily growing vigour, is by no means a new phenomenon. It is, indeed, comparatively new in this country, where it became visible only a few years since; but about thirty years ago a metaphysico-political school was formed on the Continent by a few individuals of first-rate talent, in order to bring back mankind in matters of religion to an unconditional submission to the authority of the pope, and in politics to that of the monarch. The chief founders and leaders of this school were the celebrated Abbé de Lamennais, who has since abjured those principles, and ranks now foremost amongst the opponents of Rome and the promoters of the most ultra-democratic principles; the Vicomte de Bonald; and Count de Maistre, whose works are now under consideration. Count J. de Maistre belongs to a distinguished family of Savoy, where he was born, 1753. He was, before the French revolution, senator in his country, and followed, afterwards, to Sardinia his monarch, driven from his continental states by the French. He remained at St. Petersburg, as an envoy of his king, from 1804 to 1817, and was afterwards a minister of state at Turin, where he died in 1821. He was a deeply learned man, possessing a thorough knowledge of classical literature, as well as of that of the principal countries of Europe;

he was well versed in the writings of the ancient fathers, ecclesiastical history, and the controversial works of Roman catholics as well as of protestants. He appears to have been acquainted with the principal authors of this country, particularly those who wrote on political and religious subjects, and to have carefully followed all the parliamentary debates which related to the Roman-catholic question. His long residence at St. Petersburg gave him an opportunity of acquiring the Russian and the old Slavonic, which is the sacred and liturgic language of all the Slavonian nations who adhere to the Eastern church. Such information, of which few writers may boast, was accompanied by first-rate talent as a writer. His style is animated, energetic, and impressive. His language is beautiful and correct. Nothing can be more masterly than the manner in which he handles every subject which he undertakes, either to attack or to defend. He pours out the treasures of his erudition in the manner most appropriate to the object of discussion, always bearing on the same point, and never straying from it. He is never scurrilous or abusive, but addresses his adversaries in courteous and winning language. His intimate acquaintance with the writings of his opponents often enables him to combat their principles with passages extracted from their own works; and, indeed, he acknowledges that his favourite method is to combat with arms carried off from the enemy's camp. Whenever he despairs to convince by argument, he endeavours to win, by addressing the passions and prejudices of whole classes, and no one acquainted with human nature can doubt that this is often more successful than the most logical argumentation. He also seems to be perfectly sincere in his opinions; and, indeed, it is generally acknowledged that his personal character was very respectable.* It is no wonder that the works of such a man have produced considerable effect, and created a kind of school. They have found warm admirers and zealous partisans in France amongst the ultra-royalist party, and religious Roman-catholic associations in that country, as well as in Belgium, have zealously promoted their circulation. They are well known in this country amongst those who are acquainted with French literature, and particularly amongst the higher classes.

Count de Maistre deserves the thanks of every Christian, to whatever denomination he may belong, for the powerful and effective manner in which he combats the mischievous doctrines of Voltaire and other infidels, miscalled the philosophers of the

* He must not be confounded with his brother, Count Xavier de Maistre, a General Officer in the Russian service, and well known in French literature by his witty essay, *Voyage autour de ma chambre*, and his charming tales, *Le Lepreu d'Aoste*, *Le Prisonnier de Caucase*, *&c.*

eighteenth century. But unfortunately he labours at the same time with all his might to support those errors and abuses with which the ignorance of the middle ages has infected the church of Rome, and which have given a free scope to the assaults of that very school which he assails. The religious and political system of Count de Maistre reposes on the doctrine, that man, being degraded by original sin, his life is destined to expiate that sin, but that the sufferings consequent on this state of things may be removed, or at least mitigated, by prayer and the supererogatory merits of the pious; that men, being fundamentally corrupt, would not employ their time for this end, and that governments, therefore, which are all from God, must be severe and absolute, they being infallible, and their will consequently law; their authority may be limited only by that of the pope, who may act as a judge between the governments and the governed, being the superior of sovereigns as well as of nations. This exposition of the true principles of the papal system is very important, as it sets entirely aside the pretensions of Romanist writers, that their church is much more favourable to political liberty than the doctrines of the Reformation; pretensions which, in spite of their absurdity, have acquired, by the political complications of this country, such a degree of plausibility, that many sincere protestants labour under the delusion. One of the most remarkable circumstances connected with the works of Count de Maistre, and which proves his extraordinary perspicuity, is, that as early as 1817 he predicted that movement towards Rome which is now agitating the Anglican church under the name of Puseyism.

He begins his work on the pope, written in 1817, by endeavouring to establish, as the fundamental dogma, and the corner stone of ecclesiastical polity, the infallibility of that ecclesiastic. The arguments which he employs for that purpose are of an original description. He says—

'The infallibility in the spiritual order, and the sovereignty in the temporal one, are two words perfectly synonymous. Both these words express that high power which rules all others, and from which all others are derived, which governs and is not governed, which judges and is not judged.

'It is very important to remark that when we say, *that the church is infallible*, we do not claim for her any peculiar privileges, we only claim that she should enjoy a right common to every possible sovereignty, all of which necessarily act as if they were infallible; because every government is absolute, and from the moment when it becomes possible to resist it, under the pretence of error or injustice, it ceases to exist. . . .

'It is no less evident that in the judicial order, which is but a part

of the government, it is absolutely necessary to arrive at a power, which judges and is not judged, precisely because it pronounces in the name of the Supreme Power, of which it is deemed to be the representative. Give to that high judicial power such a name or form as you like, it will be always necessary that there should be such a one, to whom it will be impossible to say, *You have erred.* . . .

'Now, if there is something evident, for reason as well as for faith, it is that the church universal is a monarchy. The idea of the *universality* alone supposes that form of government, of which the absolute necessity is based on two reasons; the number of its subjects, and the geographical extent of the empire. . . .

'Bellarmin understands it so; and he admits, with perfect candour, that a limited monarchical government is better than a pure monarchy.* It may be remarked that the monarchical form has never been contested or disparaged, except by those whom it restrained.

'In the sixteenth century, the revolted ascribed the sovereignty to the *church*,—i. e., to the people. The eighteenth did nothing but transfer those maxims to politics; it is the same system, the same theory, even in its last consequences. What difference is there between *the church of God, conducted only by his word, and the great republic one and indivisible, governed only by the laws and the deputies of the sovereign people?* None! It is the same folly, having only changed in time and name.

'What is a republic as soon as it exceeds certain dimensions? It is a country more or less large, commanded by a number of men, who call themselves the *Republic*. But the government is always one, and there is not and cannot be a disseminated republic. Thus, in the times of the Roman republic, the republican sovereignty was in the *forum;* and the countries subject to it, that is to say, about two-thirds of the known world were a monarchy of which the *forum* was the absolute and pitiless sovereign.

'If you take away that ruling state, there will not remain any bond or common government, and all unity disappears.

'It is, therefore, very improperly that the presbyterian churches have pretended to induce us, by dint of speaking, to admit as a possible supposition, the republican form which does by no means belong to them, except in a divided and particular sense, that is to say, that every country has its own church, which is republican; but there is not and cannot be a Christian republican church; so that the presbyterian form effaces the article of the symbol which the ministers of that creed are obliged to pronounce at least every Sunday—*I believe in the church, one, holy, universal, and apostolic.* Because, as soon as there is no longer either a centre or common government, there can be no unity, and consequently no *church universal* (or catholic), since there is no particular church, which has, in admitting that supposition, *the constitutional means* to know whether she has a community of faith with other churches.

* Bellarmin, de Summo Pontifice, cap. iii.

'To maintain that a number of independent churches form a *one and universal church*, is the same as to maintain, in other terms, that the political governments of Europe form only a single government *one and universal*. These two ideas are identical, and there is no means to quibble about it.

'If somebody had proposed *a kingdom of France without a King of France, an empire of Russia without an Emperor of Russia*, &c., it would be justly believed that he had lost his wits; it would be, however, strictly the same idea as that of *a universal church without a chief*.

* * * * *

'The monarchical form being once established, infallibility is only the necessary consequence of the *supremacy*, or rather, it is absolutely the same thing under two different names. But although this identity is evident, people never did and never wish to see that the whole question depends on that truth; and this truth, depending itself on the very nature of things, needs not at all the support of theology, so that, in speaking of unity, error, if it was even possible, could not be opposed to the sovereign pontiff, as it (error) cannot be opposed to the temporal sovereigns, who have never pretended to be infallible. In fact, it is the same thing in practice, whether one is not subject to error, or whether it is impossible to accuse him of it. Thus should it even be agreed that no divine promise was given to the pope, he would be no less infallible, or deemed to be such, as the last tribunal; because every judgment from which there is no appeal, is and must be considered just, in every human association, under every imaginable form of government; and every true statesman will understand me, when I say, that it matters not only to know whether the sovereign pontiff *is*, but whether he must be infallible.'

This is certainly a novel and original mode of proving the infallibility of the pope, and the arguments employed for that purpose by the author are undoubtedly logical, but based entirely upon false premises. It is, indeed, not necessary to be a great statesman, in order to know that no political community can exist without possessing a sovereign—that is to say, an authority somewhere vested and specified in some manner; but in itself, absolute and uncontrolled. It is the same principle which rules Persia and the United States, except that it is exercised by the Shah at Teheran, and by the Congress at Washington; and the only difference between those governments lies in the manner in which the *sovereign*, or the supreme, absolute, and uncontrolled power, is established, distributed, and executed. But every one who is a little conversant with the principles of political philosophy knows likewise that, the reason wherefore a community submits to such an authority is inevitable necessity, as there are no other means of repressing violence and securing the enjoyment of property and other rights to all the members of that

community. In a word, the foundation of such an authority is *expediency*. The same case is in the judicial authority, judging without appeal, as the risk of having sometimes an unjust verdict presents much less danger than the certainty of having none at all which can be executed. It is the same principle of expediency which regulates the laws of *prescription*, by which the rights of individuals are sometimes sacrificed for the general security of property. But we think it a very startling proposition to apply this principle as the means of testing the truths most important to mankind. We admit that it is possible, and even necessary to mankind, to say, in many cases, I submit to this and that, because it is expedient to do so, but we cannot conceive in what case a man can conscientiously say, 'I believe it, because it is expedient to believe,' unless religion becomes a matter of mere form. We also conceive that such a man as Voltaire could say—

'Et si Dieu n'existait pas il faudrait l'inventer :'

and that pagan and infidel politicians might talk about the necessity of a religion in order to keep people in submission to the government. This is very natural in persons who have no religion themselves, but that such a good Roman-catholic writer as Count de Maistre should bring forward such an argument, is indeed very strange; and we may observe that the infallibility of the chief of Mahommedanism might be established upon equally good grounds as that of the pope, by employing the argument used by the author. Yet, although none of the defenders of that school had perhaps ventured to argue in such a daring manner, it is their general practice to establish a paradoxical position, and to deduce from it strictly logical consequences, by which many superficial and imaginative minds are easily led astray. Their opponents ought, therefore, always to attack their premises, which, once overturned, the consequences will of themselves fall to the ground.

As for the unity and universality of the church, there cannot be any other than the community of all true believers. We consider all such as members of the church universal and as our brethren in Christ, whatever denomination they belong to, or whatever imperfections or superstitious practices disfigure and encumber their profession. Our Saviour has expressly declared, that when two or three meet together in his name, he will be with them. This is a positive declaration, and no human authority can overturn it. Our author is perfectly aware of the difficulty, and says of this passage:—

'I ask what do these words signify, and it will be very difficult to induce me to see in them anything else but what I do see, which is

a promise made to men, *that God will lend an ear more particularly merciful to every assembly of men united to pray to him.*'—*Du Pape*, p. 13.

Now we protestants do not want anything more than that God should mercifully hear our prayers.

The author expatiates largely on this subject, in order to prove the superiority of the pope over councils. He combats the opinions expressed on this subject by Bossuet, Fleury, and other defenders of the Gallican church, and endeavours to establish his position, by quoting not only Roman-catholic but Greek and protestant divines, who considered the pope as chief of the Roman-catholic church. We shall not enter into all these dissertations, supported by much learning and sophistry, but cannot omit mentioning the manner in which he defends several doctrines and practices of his church, for which there is no foundation whatever in the gospel. The favourite arguments which he employs on such occasions are analogies existing between the above mentioned doctrines and practices and those of several nations of the world. This he acknowledges himself in the following manner:—

'I confess that I am very fond of practical ideas, and above all, of those striking analogies which are found between the dogmas of Christianity (read Roman catholic) and those universal doctrines which were always professed by mankind, and to which it is impossible to assign any human origin.'—*Soirées de St. Petersbourg*, vol. ii., p. 180.

As an instance of this mode of arguing, we may select his theory of *indulgences*, as one of the most important differences between the Roman-catholic and the protestant church.

'It is a fact,' he says, 'that this is a belief which is as natural to man as sight or breath, and this belief throws the greatest light on the ways of Providence in the government of the moral world. I am now exposing this universal dogma in the doctrine of the church on a point which created so much rumour in the sixteenth century, and which was the first pretext for one of the greatest crimes which men have committed against God. There is not, however, a protestant father who had not granted indulgences in his house, who had not pardoned a child deserving punishment *through the intercession* and *for the merits* of another child with whom he had reason to be satisfied. There is no protestant sovereign who has not granted fifty *indulgences* during his reign, in granting an office, in pardoning or commuting a punishment, &c., *through the merits* of fathers, brothers, sons, relatives, or ancestors. This principle is so general and so natural, that it shows itself at every moment in the slightest acts of human justice. You have laughed many times at the silly balance which Homer has placed in the hands of his Jupiter, apparently to render him ridiculous.

Christianity shews us quite another balance. On one side all the crimes; on the other, all the atonements. In one scale the good works of all men, the blood of martyrs, the sacrifice and tears of innocence accumulate, in order to form a counterpoise to the evil which, since the origin of things, pours its envenomed floods into the other scale. Salvation will overcome in the end, and in order to accelerate that universal work, as well as that expectation for which *the whole creation groaneth*, it is sufficient that man should will. He not only enjoys his own merits, but the atonement of others are imputed to him by the eternal justice, provided he should have willed it, and had rendered himself worthy of that *reversibility*. Our separated brethren have contested this principle, as if the *redemption* which they worship with us was something different from *a great indulgence granted* TO MANKIND *by the* INFINITE *merits of the greatest innocence voluntarily immolated for us*. There is a very important observation to be made on this point; man who is the son of truth is so thoroughly created for the truth, that he cannot be deceived except by a corruption or misinterpretation of that very truth. They have said: *The God-man has paid for us, consequently we have no need of any other merits;* they ought to have said, *consequently the merits of the innocent may serve the guilty*. As the redemption is nothing else than a *great indulgence*, indulgence in its turn is but a *diminished redemption*. The disproportion is undoubtedly immense; but the principle is the same, and the analogy is incontestable. Is not the *general indulgence* vain for him who wills not to profit by it, and who destroys it, as far as it regards himself, by the bad use which he makes of his liberty ?* The same case is with the *particular redemption*. It seems as if error was forewarned against this analogy, by denying the merit of good works; but the frightful grandeur of man is such that the sovereign ruler and the king of virtues *treats him with respect.*† He acts not for him, except with him, he does not force his will; it is necessary that man should, by a humble and courageous co-operation, appropriate to himself that atonement, for otherwise it will remain foreign to him. *He must undoubtedly pray as if he could do nothing, but he must act as if he could do everything.*‡ Nothing is granted except to his efforts, whether he possesses his own merits, or appropriates to himself those of another.'—*Soirées de St. Petersbourg*, vol. ii., p. 181.

The absurdity of such a doctrine, diametrically opposed to the most positive texts of Scripture, is evident. Either the redemption of mankind by the atonement of our Saviour was complete or it was not. In the first case, what need is there of any diminished redemption ? and would not the author, as well as

* Words taken from the poem on Grace, by Louis Racine.

† Wisdom of Solomon, c. xii., v. 18. The text of the vulgate quoted by our author says *cum magna reverentia*, but the English version says, *with great favour*.

‡ Words taken from the poem on Grace, by Louis Racine.

every Roman-catholic Christian, be shocked at the bare idea of the supposition that they asserted the second! Yet we see no medium between them. But the Roman-catholic church avoids such impertinent inferences from its doctrines, and our author says, in speaking of Bible societies:

'It is not the *reading* but the teaching of the Holy Scriptures that is useful; the tender dove which swallows and partly triturates the grain, which she afterwards gives to her young, is the natural image of the church, explaining to the faithful that written word which she has adapted to their understanding. The Holy Scriptures, read without notes and explanation, are a poison.'—Ibid., p. 214.

We have here, indeed, a fine specimen of what the Scriptures may be rendered in our author's doctrine of Indulgences. Yet *reserve in teaching* has been recommended in our days by members of a *protestant university.*

In his defence of Auricular Confession, our advocate makes not an attempt to support it by the language of St. James, 'Confess your faults one to another,' &c., as is usual with writers of his school. He rests his defence entirely on his favourite mode of reasoning by analogy.

'There is not a dogma in the catholic church,' he says, 'not even a general custom belonging to the high discipline, which has not its roots in the extreme depths of human nature, and consequently in some general opinion, more or less altered here and there, but common in its principle to all nations. The development of this principle would furnish a subject for an interesting work. I shall not stray much from my subject by giving a single instance of that marvellous accord; I shall choose confession, only in order to make myself better understood. What may be more natural to man than that movement of heart *which leans to another in order to pour into it a secret?** The unfortunate who is torn by remorse or grief, needs a friend, a confidant, who will listen, console, and sometimes direct him. The stomach which contains poison, and which suffers a spontaneous convulsion in order to eject it, is the natural image of a heart into which crime has poured its poison. It suffers, it is agitated, it contracts itself, until it has met with the ear of friendship, or at least with that of kindness.

'But when we pass from confidence to confession, and when the avowal is made to authority, universal conscience acknowledges in that spontaneous confession an expiating power and merit of grace. There is but one sentiment on this point, from the mother who interrogates her child about broken crockery, or sweetmeats eaten against her orders, to the judge who interrogates the thief or the murderer.

'It often happens that the guilty refuses the impunity which he might obtain by silence. A mysterious instinct, even stronger than

* Expression of Bossuet in his funeral sermon for the Queen of England.

that of self-preservation, urges him to seek the punishment which he might have avoided. Even in cases where he has no fear, either of witnesses or torture, he exclaims—Yes, it is I ! And I might quote merciful legislations, which entrust in such cases the high magistrates with the power of mitigating punishment without recurring to the sovereign.

'It is impossible not to acknowledge in the simple avowal of our faults, independently of every supernatural idea, something which is infinitely conducive to establish in man rectitude of heart and simplicity of conduct. Moreover, as every crime is, by its nature, a reason for committing another, every spontaneous avowal is, on the contrary, a reason for amendment; it equally saves the guilty from despair and obduracy, to one or other of which crime cannot abide in man without conducting him.

'' Do you know,' said Seneca, 'why we conceal our vices? Because we are plunged in them; as soon as we *confess* them, we shall be cured.' . . . All the legislators of the world have acknowledged these truths, and have turned them to the profit of humanity.

'Moses stands at their head. He establishes in his laws an *express confession*, and even a public one.*

'The ancient legislator in India has said,

'In proportion as a man who has committed a sin shall truly and voluntarily confess it, so far he is disengaged from that offence, like a snake from a slough. The same ideas have acted everywhere and in all times; confession was found amongst all nations who had received the Eleusinian mysteries. It was found in Peru, amongst the Brahmins—the Turks, in Thibet and Japan.

'How has Christianity acted on this point, as well as on all others? It has revealed man to himself; it has laid hold of his inclinations, of his universal and eternal beliefs; it has uncovered these antique foundations; it has cleared them from every soil, and has honoured them by a divine stamp; and on these *natural* foundations it has established the *supernatural* theory of penitence and sacramental confession.'—*Du Pape*, p. 297.

We agree with the author in all that he says about the spontaneous avowal of our faults, be they great or small, and that this is the surest road to amendment; we also agree that the feeling of its necessity is deeply implanted by the Almighty in the human heart, and that those superior minds who have appeared amongst many nations having arrived at that truth, by a deep study of the moral nature of man, had made use of it either in their codes of laws, or precepts of morality; but we do not see any reason whatever why Christians should establish a supernatural theory on what has no foundation in the Bible. If we are to believe supernatural things, for which we have not the

* Leviticus, v. 5, 15, and 18; vi. 6. Numbers, v. 6, 7.

authority of revelation, why should we not admit all those superstitions which spring from feelings inherent in the human heart, such as love, fear, hope, &c. We therefore protest against this confusion of divine truth with the offspring of such feelings, which, though sometimes right, cannot, if adopted as a whole, but lead astray those who are not enlightened by the gospel. We also protest against his expression, when he says that Christianity has laid hold of the inclination of man, &c. He ought to have said Roman catholicism, which has based its dogmas and discipline on *the depths of human nature*,—i. e., on the weaknesses inherent in that nature. The same, however, was done by the Egyptian priests, the Persian magi, and other hierarchies, which have enslaved and kept mankind in subjection in different countries and ages. The framers and supporters of these systems not being enlightened by divine revelation, endeavoured to guide the moral life of mankind by means of human agency, supported by the invention of a divine authority. This fraud may plead expediency in its excuse, but what can be urged for those who, having received the revealed truths, prefer to them the vain sophistries of human wisdom. It appears also to us protestants a rather strange theory which places the inspired lawgiver of the Hebrews *at the head of profane* legislators.

But the author out-herods Herod by his arguments in favour of the celibacy of priests, which begins now to be in great favour with certain divines of the Anglican church, to whose edification we recommend what follows:—

'It is an opinion common to men of all ages, all places, and all religions, *that there is in continence something heavenly, which exalts man, and renders him agreeable to divinity, and that by a natural consequence, every sacerdotal function, every religious act, every sacred ceremony, agrees but little, or does not agree at all, with marriage.*

'There is no legislation in the world which has not in some manner constrained the priests in this point, and which has not made, even in regard to other men, a more or less severe abstinence, an accompaniment of prayers, sacrifices, and solemn ceremonies.

'The Hebrew priests could not marry a repudiated woman, and the high priest could not even marry a widow.

'The Talmud adds, that he could not marry two wives, although polygamy was allowed to the rest of the nation, and all (the priests) were obliged to be pure in order to enter the sanctuary.

'The Egyptian priests had likewise only one wife. The hierophant of the Greeks was obliged to preserve celibacy and the most rigorous continence.

'Origen informs us what means were employed by the hierophant in order to enable him to keep his vow, by which antiquity expressly confessed the great importance of continence in the sacerdotal functions, and the weakness of human nature reduced to its own forces.

'The priests in Ethiopia, as well as in Egypt, were recluses, and preserved celibacy; and Virgil observes, as shining in the Elysian fields,—

'The priests who always preserved chastity.'

'The priestesses of Ceres at Athens, where the laws invested them with the highest importance, were chosen by the people, and fed at the public expense. They consecrated their lives to the worship of the goddess, and were obliged to live in the most severe continence.

'Such was the opinion of all the known world; and after a lapse of centuries, we find the same ideas in Peru. What price, what honours have not all nations of the world granted to virginity? Although marriage is the natural state of man in general, and even a holy state according to an opinion equally general, there is however a certain respect which is apparent everywhere, for a virgin; she is considered as a superior being; and when she loses that quality, even in a lawful manner, it appears as if she were degrading herself. The affianced women in Greece owed to Diana a sacrifice as an expiation for this kind of profanation. The laws had established at Athens peculiar mysteries relating to that ceremony. The women strictly observed those rites, being afraid of the goddess's ire, should they neglect their observance.* Virgins consecrated to God are to be found everywhere, and in all epochs of mankind. Is there anything more celebrated in the world than the vestals? *The Roman empire shone with the worship of Vesta, it fell together with it.*

'The sacred fire in the temple of Minerva at Athens was preserved as it was at Rome, by virgins. The same vestals were found amongst other nations, as in India and in Peru, and what is very remarkable in this last-named country, the violation of their vow was punished in the very same manner as at Rome,—virginity being considered there as a sacred character equally agreeable to the emperor and to the divinity.

'In India, the laws of Menu declare, that all the ceremonies which are prescribed for marriages concern only virgins, those females who do not belong to them being excluded from every legal ceremony.

'The voluptuous legislator of Asia has however said—The disciples of Jesus preserved virginity, although it was not commanded *by the desire which they had to please God.* The daughter of Jehosaphat preserved her virginity. God breathed his spirit into her, she believed the words of her Lord and the Scriptures. She was of the number of those who obey. *Whence comes, then, this universal sentiment?*

* * * * * *

'I return to the eternal dogma of mankind—*That nothing is more agreeable to the divinity than continence, and that not only every sacerdotal function, but every sacrifice, every prayer, every religious act required preparations, more or less conformable to that virtue.*

* 'Every one who is acquainted with the manners of the ancients cannot but marvel whence could be derived a sentiment which had established *such mysteries*, and had the force to persuade men of their importance. It must necessarily have some root, but where is it humanly to be found.'—*Note of the Author.*

'Such was the universal opinion of the ancient world. The navigators of the fifteenth century having doubled the universe, if we so may express ourselves, found the same opinions in the new hemisphere. An idea which is common to nations so different from each other, and who never had any point of contact, is it not natural? Does it not necessarily belong to the spiritual essence which constitutes us what we are? Whence could all have taken it, if it were not innate?'

Our limits preclude us from examining in detail the quotations adduced by our author in support of celibacy. We think, however, it might easily be proved, that man, notwithstanding his fallen condition, has preserved in all ages and countries a certain sense of virtue, more or less distinct according to the intellectual cultivation of the nation to which he belonged. The idea of subjecting our passions to the dictates of reason was never lost amongst mankind, except, perhaps, in some few cases of the lowest mental degradation. But although this obligation was never entirely lost sight of, it always manifested itself in a manner more or less perverted. Nothing is perhaps more difficult to the generality of men than to overcome the natural feelings and impulses implanted in their hearts for the continuation of their race. Yet it was precisely that difficulty which excited admiration amongst different nations for those who had vanquished them, and the universal laxity of manners which prevailed in the ancient world, and now prevails amongst nations unenlightened by the gospel, rendering the contrast more striking, increased the intensity of such admiration. We think the universal respect which our author has traced with so much care through all ages and countries, is the natural result of that admiration which mankind entertains for those who overcome difficulties, and is not in any degree the consequence of a peculiar principle as he pretends. We also think that the sanctions given to marriage in the inspired volume, whether by positive injunction or by obvious implication, are of much more value than all those traditions and customs of Jews, Pagans, and Infidels, which he has adduced in support of the celibacy imposed by his church on her ministers.

Count de Maistre has based his arguments on the weakness of our nature, and has consequently relied on reasonings as absurd as those which an eminent clergyman found a few years ago employed for the same purpose in Ireland.* But our author knew perfectly well what he was about, and nothing can give a better idea of his talent and perspicacity, than the manner in which he handles the subject of the churches which are opposed to his own.

* 'Ireland;' by the Hon. and Rev. Baptist Noel, p. 24.

The most important, and, to our readers, the most interesting of his remarks, are those which relate to the established church of our own country.

'Everything,' he says, 'seems to demonstrate that the English nation is destined to begin that great religious movement which is now preparing, and which will become a sacred epoch in the annals of mankind. They possess two inappreciable advantages, of which they are not themselves aware, but which will enable them to arrive at the truth, who were the first to abjure it. These advantages consist in that most fortunate contradiction, which makes their religious system at the same time the most evidently false, and most evidently the nearest to truth. There is no need of research or arguments to know that the Anglican religion is false. It is prejudged by intuition; it is false as the sun is clear; it is quite sufficient to look at it. *The Anglican hierarchy stands isolated in Christendom, consequently it is null.* Nothing sensible can be replied to this simple observation. Its episcopacy is equally rejected by the catholic church, and by the protestant. But when it is neither catholic nor protestant, what is it then? Nothing at all. It is a civil and local establishment, diametrically opposed to the universality, which is the exclusive sign of truth. Either this religion is false, or God became incarnate for the English. There is no medium between these two propositions. Their divines frequently appeal to the establishment, without perceiving that this very word annuls their religion, because it admits novelty and human action, two great anathemas, equally visible, decisive, and indelible. Other divines of the same school, and even prelates, wishing to escape from those anathemas of which they have an involuntary conviction, adopted the strange expedient of maintaining *that they were not protestants;* upon which we may say to them—*Who are you, then? Apostolical,** they say. But this is undoubtedly only to make us laugh, if it were possible to laugh at such serious subjects, and at such estimable men.

'The Anglican church is moreover the only association in the world which has declared herself to be null and ridiculous by the very act of her constitution. She solemnly proclaimed in this act the Thirty-nine Articles, neither more nor less, absolutely necessary to salvation, and which it is necessary to swear, in order to belong to that church. But one of these articles (the twenty-fifth) solemnly declares that God, in constituting his church, has not left infallibility on the earth, that all

* The author says in another place of the same book, 'The Anglican church, to the good sense and pride of which, it is equally repugnant to be in pretty bad company, has for some time imagined that she is not *protestant.* Some members of the clergy have openly defended this thesis, and, as by admitting this supposition, they found themselves to be without a name, they said that they were apostolicals. It appears, however, that it is too late for giving to one's self a name, and Europe is become too impertinent to believe such an ennoblement. The parliament, meanwhile, lets the *apostolicals* call themselves as they please, and ceases not to *protest* that it is *protestant.*'—*Du Pape,* p. 385.

the churches, beginning by that of Rome, have erred; that they have grossly erred in point of *dogma, even in point of morals;* so that none of them professes the right of prescribing a belief, and that the Holy Scriptures are the only rule of the Christian. The Anglican church consequently declares to her children, that she has a right to command them, but that they also have a right not to obey her. At the same moment, with the same pen, with the same ink, and on the same paper, she declares the dogma, and declares that she has no right to declare it. I hope that in the interminable catalogue of human follies, this will always hold one of the first places.*

'After this solemn declaration of the Anglican church, nothing was wanting but the evidence of civil authority, to ratify that judgment, and this is found in the parliamentary debates on the catholic emancipation, in 1805. In one of those noisy meetings, which only serve to prepare a more distant and more happy epoch, a sentence escaped the attorney-general of his Majesty, the King of Great Britain, which, as it seems to me, has not been remarked, but which, nevertheless, is one of the most curious things which had been uttered in Europe for a century:—'*I think*,' said he, addressing the House of Commons, '*that no alternative can exist between keeping the establishment we have, and putting a Roman-catholic establishment in its place.*'†

'The comment on this inappreciable ingeniousness is very simple. It is as if the attorney-general had said, 'Our religion is, as you know, only a purely civil establishment, which has no other support than the law of the country and the interest of every individual. Why are we Anglicans? Certainly, not because we are influenced by persuasion, but from fear of losing our goods, honours, and privileges. The *word* faith, having consequently no meaning in our language, and the conscience of the English being catholic, we shall obey it from the moment that it shall not cost us anything. In one instant we shall be all catholics.'

'But if there is nothing so evidently false as the Anglican system, on the other hand, it does recommend itself to us as being the nearest to the truth. Controlled by three terrible sovereigns, and it is our duty to say, controlled likewise by a superior good sense, the English could, in the sixteenth century, resist to a remarkable point that torrent which was carrying away other nations, so as to preserve several catholic elements. Hence that ambiguous physiognomy which distinguishes the Anglican church, and which so many writers have observed. She is, undoubtedly, not the legitimate spouse, but the mistress of a king; and although evidently the daughter of Calvin, she has not the brazen-faced appearance of her sisters. Raising her head with a majestic air, she utters in a sufficiently distinct manner

* The Article 25 is evidently by mistake quoted for the Article 20. The author is not correct in stating that the articles declare that all churches, beginning by that of Rome, have erred, whilst it is said (Article 19), 'As the church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, have erred, so also the church of Rome hath erred,' &c.

† Parliamentary Debates; vol. iv. p. 943. London. 1805.

the names of *fathers*, *council*, and *chiefs of the church;* her hand wears the crozier with ease, she seriously speaks of her nobility, and under the mask of an isolated and rebellious mitre, knows how to preserve a certain remainder of ancient grace,—venerable wreck of a dignity which is no longer. O noble English! you formerly were the first enemies of unity; to-day, the honour of bringing it back in Europe devolves upon you. Error raises there its head, only because our two languages (English and French) are enemies. If they become allied on the first of these subjects, nothing will resist them. It matters only to seize the fortunate opportunity which politics present to you at this moment. One single act of justice, and time will do the rest.'—*Du Pape*, pp. 423—428.

This was written in 1817, when few, if any, persons in this country foresaw that 'great movement' which, according to the prediction of the author, 'the English nation is destined to begin,' and which has actually commenced, and is advancing with fearful rapidity.

The political doctrines of popery, as developed in the works under review, deserve particular notice. They constitute a practical refutation of the opinion, that catholicism is more favourable to political liberty than protestantism, or at least, that it is not less so. This opinion, artfully supported by some writers, originated in this country from the unnatural position in which the Roman catholics stood towards the protestants, when the latter, having vanquished the defenders of absolutism, became themselves oppressors of their opponents. This state of things produced its natural results, in rendering the vanquished more liberal than the victors.

We have already quoted the passage of our author, where he complains of the influence which the reformation of the sixteenth century had produced on the political opinions of the eighteenth. He developes his ideas on this subject in a more distinct manner, in the following passage, where he speaks of the influence of learning and free discussion on the state of society:—

'On all parts they (the learned men, *savants*) have usurped an influence without limits; and still, if there is anything certain in this world, it is, according to my opinion, that it belongs not to science to guide men. Nothing that is necessary is entrusted to it; only a madman may believe, that God has charged academies with instructing us what we owe to him. It belongs to prelates, to the noblemen, and to the great officers of the state to be the depositaries of the conservative truths, to teach nations what is good and what is bad, what is true and what is false in the moral and spiritual order. Others have no right to reason upon such matters. They have natural sciences for their amusement. Of what can they complain? He who speaks or writes in order to take a national dogma from a people, ought to be hanged

like a domestic thief. Even Rousseau has admitted it, without thinking of what he asked for himself.* Why was the imprudence committed of granting speech to everybody? This is what has lost us.'—*Soirées de St. Petersbourg*, vol. ii., p. 99.

This is indeed a startling commentary on the liberty of the press. But many persons will object that it is nothing more than the personal opinion of the author, not warranted by the doctrines of the Roman-catholic church. But, in the first place, the Roman-catholic writers who have endeavoured to establish political liberty on the doctrines of the Roman-catholic church, as, for instance, the Abbé de Lamennais, were condemned by the pope in the most unqualified manner, whilst all those who have supported despotism by the same doctrines have always been praised and favoured. Protestants may indulge in the wildest theories about the application of religion to politics, without being controlled by any other authority than that of other writers who may choose to refute them; but whenever a Roman-catholic makes such an application, the authority of his church never fails to condemn it. We shall, however, give them another unanswerable proof, that this is a positive doctrine of that church, neither unauthorized nor obsolete, but proclaimed in the most solemn manner by the present pope himself, in his encyclical letter, addressed to the Roman-catholic clergy, and dated the 15th August, 1832.

After many complaints of the evils of the present times, such as the spirit of rebellion, secret societies, contempt for clerical authority, attempts to abolish the celibacy of the priests, and religious indifference, he continues:—

'' From this most corrupt source of *indifferentism* flows that absurd and erroneous maxim, or rather, that delirament, that it is necessary to assure and vindicate the *liberty of conscience* for whomsoever it may be. The way to this most pestilential error is prepared by that full and immoderate freedom of opinion which is widely ranging for the ruin of civil and religious society, because several assert, with an extreme impudence, that some good may result from it to religion. But St. Augustinus said, *What gives sooner death to the soul than freedom of error*;† and, indeed, every check which might retain men in the paths of truth being taken off, their nature, inclined to evil, falls into a precipice, and we may say with truth, that the *bottomless pit* is opened, that pit whence St. John saw arising a smoke which darkened the sun, and coming out locusts which devastated the earth. Hence changes of mind, corruption of youth, contempt for the most sacred things and laws spread amongst the people—in a word, the greatest

* Vide Contrat Social.

† St. Augustinus, Epistolar CLXVI.

pestilence to society, because experience shows, since the remotest antiquity, that states which had been flourishing by their riches, power, and glory, perished by that evil alone—the immoderate liberty of opinions, the licence of speech, and love of innovation.

'To this refers that wicked, detestable, and never sufficiently to be execrated liberty of the book trade, to publish any writing whatever, a liberty which several dare to demand and to promote. We are horror-struck, venerable brethren, considering with what monstrous doctrines, or rather errors, we are beset, and which are spread everywhere by an enormous multitude of books, pamphlets, and works of small volume, but great malice, and whence issues malediction spreading over the face of the earth, which we deplore. There are, however, such—oh, how it grieves us to say!—who have arrived to such a pitch of impudence as strenuously to assert that the deluge of errors pouring from that source is sufficiently compensated by some book which may appear in defence of religion amidst that flood of depravity. It is not permitted, and contrary to every law, to do on purpose a certain and a greater evil, for the hope that some good may result from it. What man in his senses will maintain, that poisons should be allowed to spread, to be publicly sold, to be carried about and even drunk, because they are remedies by which those who use them may escape from death.

'The discipline of the church, in destroying the pestilence of bad books, was very different since the times of the apostles, of whom we read, that they burnt a great quantity of books. It is sufficient to read the laws enacted on that subject by the fifth council of Lateran, and the ordinance given since that time by Leo the Tenth, our predecessor of happy memory, in order to prevent that which had been wholesomely invented for the increase of faith and the propagation of useful science, from being employed to a contrary object, and causing injury to the faithful.'

Now we ask the defenders of Romanism, who maintain that it is not opposed to political or religious liberty, what is the meaning of the declaration, that '*the liberty of conscience*,'—i. e., religious liberty, is an absurd and erroneous maxim, or rather, a *delirament;* that the liberty of the press is a wicked and detestable thing, and which can never be sufficiently execrated; and that the opinion of those who consider the censure under which the press is groaning in despotic countries, as unjust, is false, daring, and injurious to the holy see, which boasts here to have always striven to wrest from the hands of man, and to destroy with fire all the noxious and even suspected books, of which the censure belongs to its ministers. If any Roman catholic denies and abjures such doctrines, and we sincerely hope that there are many who conscientiously do so, we tell him he becomes by this very fact a *protestant,* because, as Count de Maistre has well observed, 'Whoever protests either against the

whole authority of the pope, or some points of it, becomes a *protestant.* He is either uninformed about the true doctrines of the church of Rome, or he does no longer belong to it, except nominally.' We appeal to his own sound sense, whom are we, who are without, to believe; whether the supreme chief of the church, who makes an official declaration, or a simple member of that church, who relies on no other authority than that of his private judgment,—of that very private judgment, the use of which, in matters of religion, is the constant theme of reproach to us from his party. Now the only difference between us and those Roman catholics who *sincerely* abjure the doctrines contained in the encyclical letter of the pope is, that we go farther in the exercise of that judgment than they go, but there can be no doubt that we both are acting on the same principle. We ask them, moreover, whether they will take on themselves to say that the pope is in error? Now, if this be the case, there is an end of the papal authority; if not, they have acted, in denying the necessity of the censure, and asserting the liberty of the press, '*with an extreme impudence*,' according to the words of that authority, which cannot be wrong. But are not the very same doctrines taught, although in a somewhat disguised manner, by divines who protest against being protestants, although the law of the land considers them as such, and grants them many advantages, solely on account thereof? It is quite possible to write against transubstantiation, and yet to defend some of the worst doctrines of Romanism.

We must add, that the events of these times clearly prove that the pope has much more at heart the maintenance of absolute power in Europe than the preservation of his immediate authority in some provinces, which he seems disposed to offer as a sop to Cerberus, provided he may thereby guard the remainder of his dominions from the progress of liberal views. This we see exemplified in the case of Poland and Spain. When the former country raised the banner of national independence, the Roman-catholic clergy, with a few exceptions, joined in the general movement, and several of them gave splendid proofs of a devoted patriotism. Yet that manifestation was condemned in the most unqualified manner by the present pope in his *breve*, addressed in July, 1832, to the Polish bishops. A few years afterwards, the Emperor of Russia, in whose favour the above-mentioned *breve* was issued, ordered that about four millions inhabiting the Polish provinces incorporated with Russia, who had followed for centuries that branch of the Greek church which had submitted to Rome, should abjure their obedience to the pope, and acknowledge, like the church of Russia, the emperor for their spiritual chief. The bishops were easily gained over to sign a

union with the Russian church, but a great number of the lower clergy, particularly parish priests, refused to subscribe, nobly preferring transportation to Siberia to a betrayal of their conscience. Our own religious convictions are greatly opposed to theirs, yet we cannot but feel the greatest respect for, and bestow the most unreserved praise upon, those high-minded men who preferred to suffer such a penalty rather than deny what they conscientiously believed to be the truth. But what was the conduct of the pope on that occasion? Has he denounced the Emperor of Russia as an oppressor of the church? Has he ordered public prayers to be said throughout Roman-catholic Christendom for the release of those noble martyrs, as he has done for the recovery of the church property confiscated by the Cortes of Spain? No such thing. In an allocution, which he was compelled for decency's sake to publish, he feebly complains of the bishops who had abjured his supremacy, and expresses his hopes that the *magnanimous* Emperor of Russia, the same emperor who had caused the separation, and transported to Siberia the priests who remained faithful to Rome, will set all these matters right. The absurdity of this allocution is too glaring to require any comment.

How different is the conduct of the same pope towards Spain, which has till now preserved intact the Roman-catholic church. Is not Espartero, who regularly attends mass, denounced as sacrilegious by all the adherents of papal authority? and are not public prayers ordered throughout the Roman-catholic world, in order to bring about a change in the present state of things in Spain? The reason of this contradiction is, however, obvious. Spain has adopted liberal institutions, and their indispensable accompaniment, 'the never-to-be-sufficiently execrated liberty of the press.' This will rapidly lead, not only to the religious emancipation of the Peninsula, but will also powerfully act on Italy itself.

The author endeavours to prove, by a great display of historical erudition and much sophistry, that the popes are the natural judges between monarchs and nations, and that the latter should never rise against the most tyrannical sovereigns, but apply to the pope for the redress of their wrongs. He maintains, that such a check to absolute power ought to be preferred by monarchs to that which is imposed upon them by popular constitutions, as it is much less humiliating to be controlled by the pope than by his own subjects, because the popes, in struggling against monarchs, were always acting as the delegates of God.

'Frederic,' says he, 'under the foot of the pope, might have been an object of terror, perhaps of compassion, but never of contempt, no more than David prostrated before the angel who brought him the plagues of the Lord.'—*Du Pape*, p. 335.

In another part of the same work he says,—

'That it is much better for the monarch to be deposed by the pope, than by his subjects, because the pope, in sacrificing the king, would save the majesty; he would not neglect any personal alleviations which circumstances might permit, but above all, and this deserves some attention, he would fulminate against the project of depriving the whole dynasty, even for *crimes*, and the more so, for the faults of a single head. He would teach the nations '*that it is the family which reigns; that the case which has happened is entirely similar to that of an ordinary succession, opened by death or illness; and he would end by proclaiming an anathema against every man who would be daring enough to question the rights of the reigning house.*'—Ib., p. 238.

Does not this passage forcibly remind us of certain doctrines proclaimed not very long ago, that the expulsion of the Stuarts from the throne of this country was a national sin?

The doctrines which we have exposed in this article will probably appear to the plain sense of our readers *absurd*, and many of them will perhaps wonder how it is possible that they should find converts? Yet it is an undoubted fact that similar opinions are rapidly gaining ground. We have already expressed our belief that this may be greatly attributed to that weakness of the human mind which is more easily persuaded by the quibbles of casuistry than by the arguments of a straightforward reasoning. We must add, that the doctrines we have referred to, often flatter the passions and interests of individuals and of classes, as an illustration of which, we might adduce our author's reasoning, page 359, which we should be glad to quote if our space permitted.

Let us now pause for a moment to consider once more how it comes to pass that the reaction of Rome, whether open or disguised, is, notwithstanding the striking absurdity of its pretensions, making rapid strides, and in quarters where, considering the educational advantages possessed, knowledge ought to be general. There is a great deal in the manner of promoting and defending certain doctrines to decide, at least for a time, their success or *failure;* and this appears to be the main cause to which the progress of the reactionary movement may be ascribed. The development of our views on this point would require a separate article, and we may perhaps, at some future time, attempt it. We conclude at present with the earnest hope that the reign of truth will be the result of the great struggle which is now beginning throughout all the civilized world, between the principles of Rome and those of the Reformation. This state of things is undoubtedly better than religious indifference, in the condemnation of which we entirely agree with our opponents; yet the conflict may be productive of great harm, as it

unquestionably will be severe and protracted. Unfortunately, the history of religious parties shows but few examples of a rational and peaceful discussion of great questions, devoid of bitterness and personality, and carried on with the sole object of ascertaining the truth. We therefore most earnestly beseech and sincerely exhort all our fellow protestants who are engaged in that solemn contest, never to forget in these trying circumstances the precept of Augustinus, '*In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas*,' but above all, '*in omnibus charitas*.'

Art. II. *Memoirs and Correspondence of Francis Horner, M.P.* Edited by his Brother, Leonard Horner, Esq. 2 Vols. London: J. Murray.

The name of Francis Horner is probably unknown to most of our readers. His premature death, and the rapid succession of stirring events since his day, have prevented his retaining that hold on the popular mind for which many of his early friends looked, and which the admirable qualities of his intellect warranted them in so doing. The general public will therefore need some inducement to take up the volumes before us, and this is amply supplied in the nature of their contents. It has rarely been our lot to peruse a biographical work, partly political and partly literary, which combines in so abundant a measure whatever constitutes such a work both attractive and valuable. The personal qualities of Mr. Horner, the distinguished character of his early associates, the deep interest and importance of some of the literary enterprises in which he took a prominent part, his extensive correspondence, and early introduction into the best circles of his day, all attach a charm to his *Memoirs*, which, desultory as they are, renders them one of the most interesting and informing publications which the press has issued for some time past. In a brief and modest preface, Mr. Leonard Horner informs us of the various efforts which have been made to bring out the *Memoirs* of his brother in a more continuous, and, as some would think, perfected form. From this account, we learn that the design of issuing such a work was altogether abandoned, until the publication of the memoirs of Sir Samuel Romilly suggested a new course, which has been followed out with the happiest effect in the volumes now before us. As the materials employed by the editors of that work were very similar to those in the possession of Mr. Horner's brother, the latter tells us, 'I felt an assurance that by a careful selection from the papers and correspondence, by the addition of a few pages at the commencement and close, and by filling up occasional blanks in the course

of the narrative, it would be possible to make my brother himself relate the history of his life. Such is the work I now venture to lay before the public.'

The letters given are not more than one-third of those which were in the editor's possession, while only a small number of those of his correspondents have been admitted. 'I have been obliged,' Mr. Horner remarks, 'to omit much that I would willingly have published, but I restricted my work to two volumes, which I considered the utmost length to which it could, with any propriety, be extended.' This decision was probably wise, though we confess the letters published are so valuable, that we are ready to regret more have not been given.

Mr. Francis Horner was born in Edinburgh on the 12th of August, 1778. His father was a merchant of that city, who 'had assiduously cultivated a naturally strong understanding,' and was thus well fitted, in conjunction with Mrs. Horner, to favour the early development of those talents by which their son was distinguished. 'His earliest friend was Henry Brougham,' and in 1786 he was sent to the High School of Edinburgh, whence he removed in 1792 to the University, which was then at the height of its reputation, numbering amongst its professors Robertson the historian, Dugald Stewart, John Playfair, and Hugh Blair. He remained at college until the summer of 1795, and during the last year of his residence was, in conjunction with his friend, Henry Brougham, a leading member of the 'Juvenile Literary Society.' Being designed for the Scottish bar, his father wisely determined on his prosecuting his studies, for a time, in England, in order, principally, that he might free himself from the disadvantages of a provincial dialect. In pursuit of this object he removed to the neighbourhood of London in the close of 1795, and took up his residence with the Rev. John Hewlett, of Shacklewell, a clergyman of whom he subsequently spoke in terms of uniform esteem. He was called to the Scottish bar on the 6th of June 1800, but within two years removed to London, for the purpose of entering on the wider and more remunerative field which our courts supply.

Before leaving Scotland, Mr. Horner took an active part in the origination of the Edinburgh Review, and his letters, as well as those of his correspondents, contain frequent allusions to the early history of this journal, some of which we shall extract for the information of our readers. 'The Review,' he informs us in his journal of September 30th, 1802, 'was concerted about the end of last winter between Jeffrey, Sydney Smith, and myself. The plan was immediately communicated to Murray, Allen, and Hamilton; Brown, Brougham, and the two Thompsons, have gradually been made parties.'

Considerable difficulties were experienced in the accomplishment of their design, and Mr. Jeffrey, on whom the editorship devolved, was sometimes almost disposed to abandon the project in despair. Writing to Mr. Horner under date of April 9, 1802, he says,

'I must first tell you about the Review though, that you may be satisfied it holds the first place in my affection. We are in a miserable state of backwardness, you must know, and have been giving some symptoms of despondency; various measures have been tried, at least, against the earliness of our intended day of publication; and hints have been given of a delay that I am afraid would prove fatal. Something is done, however, and a good deal, I hope, is doing. Smith has gone through more than half his task. So has Hamilton. Allen has made some progress; and Murray and myself, I believe, have studied our parts, and tuned our instruments, and are *almost ready to begin*. On the other hand, Thompson is sick, Brown has engaged for nothing but Miss Baillie's plays; and Timothy has engaged for nothing, but professed it to be his opinion the other day that he would never put pen to paper in our cause. Brougham must have a sentence to himself; and I am afraid you will not think it a pleasant one. You remember how cheerfully he approved of our plan at first, and agreed to give us an article or two without hesitation. Three or four days ago I proposed two or three books that I thought would suit him; he answered, with perfect good humour, that he had changed his view of our plan a little, and rather thought now that he should decline to have any connexion with it.'—Vol. i., p. 186.

Nothing can well be more characteristic than the closing part of this extract. Unhappily, Lord Brougham is, in this respect, much the same as was Henry Brougham, and his biographer will, in consequence, have to tell of an unsteadiness of purpose which has wasted his mental faculties and neglected opportunities of public usefulness such as no other modern statesmen has enjoyed. In the September following, we are told that 'Brougham is now an efficient and zealous member of the party,' and was engaged in the preparation of a paper for the first number. This number appeared in November, and the measure of success which attended the project is thus referred to in Mr. Horner's journal.

'November 20th.—Before I proceed to speak of my own studies, I shall make a short memorandum with respect to the reception which the first number of our Review has met with in Edinburgh, for we have not yet got an account of its fate in London. Upon the whole, I do not think we have gained much character by it; it is considered as respectable enough in point of talents, but the severity, in some of the papers, it may be called scurrility, has given general dissatisfaction. In the next number, we must soften our tone, and be more indulgent to folly and to bad taste. Jeffrey is the person who will derive most

honour from this publication, as his articles in this number are generally known, and are incomparably the best; I have received the greater pleasure from this circumstance, because the genius of that little man has remained almost unknown to all but his most intimate acquaintances. His manner is not at first pleasing; what is worse, it is of that cast, which almost irresistibly impresses upon strangers the idea of levity and superficial talents. Yet there is not any man whose real character is so much the reverse; he has indeed a very sportive and playful fancy, but it is accompanied with very extensive and varied information, with a readiness of apprehension almost intuitive, with judicious and calm discernment, with a profound and penetrating understanding. Indeed, both in point of candour and of vigour in the reasoning powers, I have never personally known a finer intellect than Jeffrey's, unless I were to except Allen's.'—Ib., pp. 205, 206.

The first impression of this number, consisting of seven hundred and fifty copies, was soon exhausted, and a second of equal extent was in consequence immediately put to press. 'You will not,' writes Mr. Horner, 'be surprised that we have given a good deal of disappointment by the temperate air of our politics; nothing short of blood and atheism and democracy were predicted by some wise and fair ones, as the necessary production of our set.' Writing to the same gentleman on the 24th of the following January, Mr. Horner gives the following brief account of the second appearance of himself and friends.

'This day we publish a second number of our Review. I think you will find it free, at least nearly so, from some of the objections that were most strongly, and all of them justly, urged against the former. There are scarcely any insignificant books—no sermons—few personalities—the general train of criticism less abusive. We are not indeed quite purified of all our gross faults, but the opinion of our friends has made a considerable impression upon us. I think this number has no articles so good as some of the last; but there is a good deal of careful disquisition.'—Ib., pp. 214, 215.

So far their success exceeded their expectations. The state both of literature and of political parties called for such a journal, and the men who combined to produce it, united the enthusiasm of youth with distinguished talents and a varied if not profound scholarship. The irreligious tone which pervaded the Review for several years was matter of deep regret, and served to alienate from its ranks many who were otherwise disposed to regard it with favour. Its course, however, apart from this consideration, was not free from discouraging circumstances. Hostility was engendered in many quarters, and on various accounts. This will always be the case with a public journal, even when its conduct is unexceptionable. Those whose opinions are

condemned will feel themselves aggrieved, and such authors as have looked in vain for the praise to which they deem their labours entitled, will naturally join the malcontents. The following letter from Mr. Jeffrey, dated December 6th, 1808, will not be uninteresting or unimportant to the future literary historian of the early part of the present century.

'I see by the Courier that the combustion which the review of Cevallos has excited here, has spread in some degree to London. I am convinced, too, that it has damaged us a little; and am so much persuaded that it is necessary for us to make more than an ordinary exertion at this crisis, that I take courage to do that which is now very painful to me—to solicit your aid in my day of need. The tories having got a handle are running us down with all their might; and the ghosts of all the miserables we have slain are rising to join the vengeance. Walter Scott and William Erskine, and about twenty-five persons of consideration, have forbidden the Review to enter their doors. The Earl of Buchan, I am informed, opened his street door, and actually *kicked* it out! Then, Cumberland is going to start an anonymous rival; and, what is worse, I have reason to believe that Scott, Ellis, Frere, Southey, and some others, are plotting another. You must see, therefore, that it is really necessary for us now to put on a manful countenance, and to call even the *emeriti* to our assistance. I entreat you to do an article for me during the holidays. We shall scarcely be out before the end of January, and I might even give you the whole of that month, if you need it. Now, I do think that you would give me 100*l.* if I was in great need of it; and this will cost you less work than you could do for 50*l.* for any knave of a solicitor, and it is of infinitely more consequence and gratification to me than any 100*l.* could be. Persuade yourself for once then, my dear Horner, that this is not a solicitation of custom, but that I make it with as much real anxiety and earnestness, and as much dread of a refusal, as if I were asking a pecuniary boon. You shall have your choice, of course, of a subject; but I wish you would put your notes and notions of Malthus together at last. It is a fine subject, and you are in a manner pledged to it. But if you can think of anything more popular or striking, take it—only no party politics, and nothing but exemplary moderation and impartiality on all politics. I have allowed too much mischief to be done from my mere indifference and love of sport; but it would be inexcusable to spoil the powerful instrument we have got hold of, for the sake of teasing and playing tricks. Tell me, too, what you think I should do myself. I grow stupid from day to day; but I will cheerfully dedicate the holidays to this service, if you will condescend to guide me.'—Ib., pp. 437—439.

We have already remarked that the present Lord Brougham was amongst the earliest friends of Mr. Horner, and we are tempted by the interest of the theme to transfer to our pages a few of the references which occur to this distinguished man.

It is obvious to remark that the same qualities, both of intellect and of heart, as are exhibited by the peer, are conspicuous in these allusions to his early character. Writing in 1798 to the Rev. John Hewlett, Mr. Horner asks—

'Had you any conversation with Brougham? He is an uncommon genius, of a *composite order*, if you allow me to use the expression; he unites the greatest ardour for general information in every branch of knowledge, and, what is more remarkable, activity in the business, and interest in the pleasures of the world, with all the powers of a mathematical intellect. Did you notice his physiognomy? I am curious to know your observations on it.'—Ib., p. 66.

Again in 1802, writing to a friend, he says:—

'Brougham has concluded a bargain about his book with Longman, who has been here making purchases of that kind; he talks of sending it to the press in about two months. The title, an 'Enquiry into the Colonial Policy of the European Powers.' That it will do him great credit, I have no doubt; I hope it may be the means of introducing him into a respectable line of political connexions. Old Liverpool wrote himself into notice by a seasonable, though puny, pamphlet on the rights of neutrals. Should an active scene be opened to Brougham, I shall tremble with anxiety for some time, though it is what I very ardently wish; his information on political subjects, especially in some departments, is now immense; his talents are equal to the most effective use and display of that knowledge. But his ardour is so urgent that I should be afraid of his being deficient in prudence. That he would ultimately become a leading and predominant mind, I cannot doubt; but he might attempt to fix himself in that place too soon, before he had gone through what, I presume, is a necessary routine of subordination,'—Ib., pp. 204, 205.

In his journal for August 26th, 1804, Mr. Horner records the particulars of a conversation he had had with Professor Playfair, respecting a scheme for a new Encyclopædia agitated at Edinburgh, which had, however, been dropped, from the difficulty of obtaining a suitable editor. The high opinion entertained of the ability and varied acquisitions of Mr. Brougham is strikingly shown in the following statement of the journalist:—

'Mr. Playfair asked me about Brougham, observing, very justly, that had he remained at Edinburgh he would have been the man for editor of the Encyclopædia. I told him fairly that I should not expect that Brougham would bestow that perseverance in composition and minute execution on which the merits of elementary treatises must very much depend, and that at any rate he was for the present wholly absorbed in political schemes, with the view of bringing himself into action, though I thought it not an improbable event, if he were disappointed in his immediate views, that he might bury himself for the remainder of his life in retirement, devoted to science and literature, and occupied with some vast scheme of literary ambition.'—Ib., pp. 258, 259.

There was a time when we should have reflected with unmingled pleasure on the fact, that the young adventurer's 'immediate views' were not disappointed. Would that it were so still, but alas! for Lord Brougham's fame, his bitterest foe cannot desire a more humiliating spectacle than his lordship at present exhibits. The sport of impetuous passions, he recklessly trifles with a reputation which was once the idol of his country, and can scarcely fail to be speedily identified with that most despicable of all classes, political apostates. But enough of this; we have shared too largely in the admiration with which Lord Brougham was formerly regarded to feel other than pain at his present degraded position. His entrance into parliament is referred to by Mr. Horner in a letter dated January 6, 1810, in terms of unmingled satisfaction, whilst an intimate knowledge of the peculiarities of his character is shown. 'Upon the whole,' says the letter writer, 'I would predict, that though he may very often cause irritation and uncertainty about him to be felt by those with whom he is politically connected, his course will prove, in the main, serviceable to the true faith of liberty and liberal principles. For him personally it will be very fortunate if he has some probationary years to pass on the opposition side of the House.'

The two men were evidently cast in very different moulds, and we are not therefore surprised that some alienation took place between them. 'His alienation from me,' says Mr. Horner to his friend Mr. Jeffrey, 'for reasons which I never have been able to guess, is the only considerable misfortune I have ever suffered in my life, and it would take quite a load off my mind if he would give me a hint to catch at, for forgetting that I ever had suffered it. I have always cherished a hope that we may in time approximate again.' This hope was subsequently in some measure realized, and Mr. Horner records the fact in terms of the most entire satisfaction.

From the commencement of his career, Mr. Horner looked to politics as his ultimate destination, and to his profession as the means of giving him an independent and influential standing among his fellow aspirants. 'Political adventure,' he remarks in his journal, 'is a game which I am disqualified from playing by many circumstances of my character, and which I am resolved to decline. But some share in public business acquired by reputation, and supported on an independent footing, is a fair object, and almost the only reward that stimulates me to the law.' In this expectation he was not disappointed. His reputation had preceded him, and as his acquaintance amongst the Whig party was extensive, he was speedily admitted to the most select circles of its members. His first visit to Earl Fitzwilliam's is thus noticed in his journal:—

'I have been at Lord Fitzwilliam's; the party, like all large ones, unsatisfactory. I had the pleasure, however, of seeing, and being introduced to, Windham and Sheridan. I heard Windham talk no more than to enchant me with his manner; Sheridan, I had an opportunity of seeing and hearing more at length, and in an appropriate manner, for he went afterwards with the younger men of the company to a tavern, where we sat till three o'clock in the morning. His serious conversation, about the defence bill and some other matters, was very tame; but his satire and pleasantry full of fire and vigour. He seems to me rather too attentive to strangers, though his manners are certainly very polished; but this courteous notice of one looks as if it had a purpose, though it may not.'—Ib., pp. 254, 255.

From this period to the close of life, his letters abound in political information, always interesting, and marked by the attributes of a mind at once honest, discriminating, and candid. The future historian of our political parties will find in these letters some of his most valuable materials, and we cannot do better than transfer a portion of them to our pages. Writing under date of May 24, 1803, when the feeble administration of Mr. Addington was struggling with the increased difficulties arising out of the expected renewal of hostilities with France, Mr. Horner says:—

'You are indebted for this letter to a severe disappointment I met with this evening, in not getting into the House of Commons. A great display is expected, on account chiefly of the nicety and various embarrassments under which the question must present itself to more than one of the parties. They are now in the very heat and pride of the debate; twelve o'clock. After waiting all the morning, I got no farther than the door of the gallery. Everybody here seems to be of one mind as to the justice of the war, in respect of the case (as we lawyers may call it) that this country can make out against Bonaparte; but the *policy* of war at the present juncture is a different question, of which people take various views.

'The old opposition party held a meeting last night to discuss their plans; I learned a few particulars of it. Fox spoke with great moderation, expressed his anxiety for the preservation of peace, but acknowledged the difficulties of the conjuncture. He had to submit to the folly of some of his associates. Would you imagine that that great statesman, Lord Suffolk, embraced this seasonable occasion of giving Fox a formal lecture upon some improprieties of his former conduct, beginning with the coalition, and ending with the evidence at Maidstone. This was meant merely as friendly advice. Sheridan was so drunk, that the first time he spoke he was unintelligible; he afterwards became more articulate, and dwelt a good deal upon the danger of throwing the doctor, by too severe an attack, into the arms of Pitt. This idea I find very prevalent among many of the friends and partisans of the old opposition. But Fox's observation was more manly;

that they were bound to expose those errors and weaknesses of which they were convinced, and were not entitled to practise an over-cautious and temporizing forbearance upon a calculation of any contingencies.'—pp. 218—220.

In a subsequent letter to Mr. Murray, he refers to the debate from which he had been excluded, and gives the following account of the speeches of Fox and Pitt:—

'By all the accounts I have collected, both Pitt and Fox made a very great display. Pitt's peroration was a complete half hour of his most powerful declamation, not lowered in its tone for a moment; not a particle of all this is preserved in the report lately published, though said to be done by Canning. Fox's speech was quite of a different cast, and not at all in the tone which he usually adopts; no high notes, no impassioned bursts, but calm, subtle, argumentative pleasantry. He very seldom attempts to keep the house laughing; but in this speech, I understand, it was evidently his design throughout, and Mackintosh says he never heard so much wit. A good many of the points are repeated, none of which are in the newspapers, but I cannot pretend to give you them. I remember, however, the compliment he paid to Pitt's speech, that 'if Demosthenes had been present, he must have admired, and might have envied.' '—Ib., p. 221.

Mr. Addington speedily resigned, when Pitt returned to office, and the old opposition, reinforced by the Grenville party, prepared for a severe struggle with the court favourite. The death, however, of Pitt, January 23, 1806, threw parties into temporary confusion. An amendment was to have been moved in the Commons on the previous day, but the illness of the minister touched the generous heart of his rival, and his subsequent death induced, of course, an abandonment of the design.

'A few hours before going down to Westminster there was a meeting at Mr. Fox's house of a few of the principal persons of opposition; Cowper was there. Fox stated to them that he thought it impossible they could enter into the discussion; he could not while they had the idea that Pitt was in extremities;—'*mentem mortalia tangunt*,' he said. Cowper described him as appearing to feel very sensibly the calamity of his distinguished rival; and he described it by saying, that Fox appeared to feel more than Lord Grenville, who was present also.' —Ib., p. 328.

The state of parties compelled the king most reluctantly to send for Lord Grenville, who immediately informed his Majesty 'that the person with whom he should consult upon this occasion was Mr. Fox,' to which, of course, the king had no alternative but to submit. The royal intentions were from the first known to be hostile to the Whig party. There was no confidence

between him and its leaders, and in taking them into his councils, it was with the intention of getting rid of them as soon as circumstances permitted. The following notices of some of the persons interested in the negotiations now carried on, occur in Mr. Horner's journal.

'In the interval between Pitt's death and the message to Lord Grenville,—that is, between Thursday and Sunday, an offer was certainly made to Lord Wellesley, from the remainder of the ministry, and, of course, with the king's approbation, to take the lead of administration. He declined it immediately and distinctly. This was made known to the prince, I presume, by Lord Wellesley himself, who has courted his Royal Highness since his arrival very assiduously, and with success; the prince mentioned it to Mr. Fox as an instance of great generosity in Wellesley. Mr. Fox probably viewed it as belonging rather to the virtue of prudence and address. This was mentioned to me by ——.

'Sheridan is very little consulted at present, and, it is said, will not have a seat in the cabinet. This is a distressing necessity. His habits of daily intoxication are probably considered as unfitting him for trust. The little that has been confided to him he has been running about to tell; and since Monday, he has been visiting Sidmouth. At a dinner at Lord Cowper's on Sunday last, where the prince was, he got drunk, as usual, and began to speak slightingly of Fox. From what grudge this behaviour proceeds I have not learned. The whole fact is one to investigate with candour, and with a full remembrance of Sheridan's great services, in the worst times, to the principles of liberty.

'So Lord Holland, according to the projected arrangement, has *not* a seat in the cabinet. He has been too disinterested; and the future operations of this ministry may suffer for it. He determined not to take a step higher than Lauderdale, who has been absent all the while; Holland would not consent to be raised over him. He has given way likewise for Lord Henry Petty, in order to secure him a high situation.' —Ib., pp. 332, 333.

Lord Ellenborough's admission to the cabinet, as one of the Addington party, was strongly objected to by Mr. Horner and others on constitutional grounds, as he might have, in his character as chief judge, 'to try those prosecutions which he had concurred in the cabinet to order.' 'These general reasons,' he remarks, 'are doubly enforced in the present instance by the character and manners of the man. In the year 1801 he changed at an hour's notice the opinions and language of his life to become a court lawyer, and has never felt the dignity of his great station a restraint upon his temper, from uttering what is to the purpose of the day with the utmost coarseness of factious warfare.'

Mr. Fox did not long survive his great rival. His health had, for some time, been declining, and now utterly failed beneath

the onerous labours of his position. He expired on the 13th of September, and the event was announced in a letter to Mr. Jeffrey, wherein the writer feelingly exclaims, 'The giant race is extinct, and we are left in the hands of little ones, whom we know to be diminutive, having measured them against the others.'

'I look upon what has been called Mr. Fox's party, the remains of the old Whig faction, as extinguished entirely with him; his name alone kept the fragments together after the party had been long ago broken to pieces. . . . . We are deprived, by this calamitous death, of our great leader in all popular principles of administration; no man of acknowledged and commanding talents is left to supply his place. But there are a few men whose integrity and steadiness have been tried, and a few others, younger men, who are confided in by those who know them best. Howick, Lauderdale, Holland, and Petty, are the persons in whom I am inclined to repose my confidence, though it seems to me that they ought to yield the supremacy to Grenville, while he perseveres in the same honourable conduct to which he has adhered since his junction with Mr. Fox. The new appointment will be a sort of test, not precisely the disposal of the seals, but the manner in which the vacant seat in the cabinet is filled. I look with very great solicitude to the course of parties during the next six months; it will be a period probably, though not at first, of severe and decisive probation. I have no fears of Lord Grenville himself; he is free from all levity or fickleness of conduct, certainly, and has given pledges which he has too much obstinacy, as well as honesty, to forfeit. A few years of opposition gave him some sentiments which will remain; and the circumstances of his family, their influence, fortune, and pretensions, make them now a knot of aristocrats, not ready to submit to the crown, but disposed to make terms. You perceive, therefore, that I consider an alliance with the Grenvilles as a measure of prudence for the Whigs; but my speculations will perhaps appear as fallacious, as you would think the subject of them unworthy of a *philosopher's* approbation, even if they were better founded in themselves.'—Ib., pp. 374—376.

In the November following, Mr. Horner was returned for the borough of St. Ives, in Cornwall, but a general election ensuing on the dismissal of the Whig administration in the spring of 1807, he was not re-elected till July, when by Lord Carrington's interest, he was returned for Wendover. The Duke of Portland's administration, which followed that consequent on the death of Mr. Fox, was but short-lived, and overtures were made to Lords Grenville and Grey to coalesce with Mr. Percival. These were of course rejected, and the approaches subsequently made by the Prince of Wales were productive of no lasting settlement. The conduct of the latter personage was at first regarded by Mr. Horner as distinguished by 'eminent propriety'

and 'perfect honour,' but the hollowness of his professions was speedily detected, and the result is shown in the following extract from a letter to Mr. Hallam, dated July 24, 1812:—

'I regret very much that you are not satisfied with the conduct of Lord Grey and Lord Grenville in their rupture of the negotiation. It is perhaps a nice question of conduct, and one of those in which there is hardly any other test but success to be resorted to. Upon the whole circumstances, particularly with what has been added to our knowledge of them by Lord Moira's subsequent conduct, and by Lord Spencer's statement in the House of Lords, I think their mode of closing the negotiation was the most honourable and upright for themselves, though, with a little more reserve, they might have left it to be terminated with more disgrace to the prince. I was prepared, I own at the same time, to pardon them if they had been less sturdy about the household, and thought, if there was a possibility of their getting power, with the views they had of using it, that they might be defended against the abuse that was in preparation for them, if they should have yielded to the court its pretensions respecting the household. I am now satisfied, looking back to the whole intrigue, that they never had any chance of coming into office, and am somewhat inclined to apprehend that the high tone of personal honour, and the strict stoical maxims of political conduct, which the present leaders of the Whig opposition are guided by, in their negotiations about office, and without the observance of which, power can have but little to gratify such men, are not calculated to obtain place for them, except in a favourable conjuncture of accidents, or to win immediate favour for them with the public, whether they gain the places or are disappointed. I will not say that nothing of the peculiarities of temper was to be detected in their prompt and peremptory manner of negotiating; but, on the other hand, they negotiated with all the odds against them, arising from their integrity and rigid honour being known to those who intrigued against them with fewer scruples. Never was there a time, in my remembrance of politics, which brought out, in so strong a light, the characters of all the persons engaged in the transaction; and I am sorry to say, that some of whom I was anxious to form or to keep a high opinion, such as Canning and Whitbread, sunk a great way in my estimation before it was all over.'—Vol. ii., pp. 113, 114.

The allusion to Mr. Whitbread at the close of this extract must not be understood as conveying a more general censure than was intended. It respected only a particular negotiation, and was perfectly consistent with a high estimate of Mr. Whitbread's integrity and services. The death of that practical senator, who represented a class of which few representatives remain amongst us, gave occasion to the following summary of his character in a letter to Mr. Hallam, July 22, 1815:—

'The event that has most agitated me since I parted from you, is the death of Whitbread, which you mentioned with sentiments that

gave me a real pleasure; for I shall ever respect his memory, and with something like affection too, for the large portion of my life which, in a certain sense, I consider as having been passed with him, and for the impression he had made upon me of his being one of the most just, upright, and intrepid of public men. As a statesman, I never regarded him at all; he had no knowledge of men or affairs to fit him for administration; his education had been very limited, and its defects were not supplied by any experience of real political business: but he must always stand high in the list of that class of public men, the peculiar growth of England and of the House of Commons, who perform great services to their country, and hold a considerable place in the sight of the world, by fearlessly expressing in that assembly the censure that is felt by the public, and by being as it were the organ of that public opinion which, in some measure, keeps our statesmen to their duty. His force of character and ability, seconded by his singular activity, had, in the present absence of all men of genius and ascendancy from the House, given him a pre-eminence which almost marks the last years of parliament with the stamp of his peculiar manner. His loss will lead to a change of this: in all points of taste and ornament, and in the skill, too, and prudence of debate, the change may probably be for the better; but it will be long before the people and the constitution are supplied in the House of Commons with a tribune of the same vigilance, assiduity, perseverance, and courage, as Samuel Whitbread. The manner of his death quite overwhelmed me, I could think of nothing else for days together, nor do I remember, in our own time, another catastrophe so morally impressive, as the instantaneous failure of all that constancy, and rectitude, and inflexibility of mind, which seemed possessions that could be lost only with life; yet all the while there was a speck morbid in the body which rendered them as precarious as life itself.'—Ib., pp. 260, 261.

The following reference to Sir Francis Burdett will not be uninstructive to those who are interested in marking the course through which the would-be patriot is transfused into the courtier. It is under date of June 26, 1810:—

'What a curious scene was exhibited last week in this city; and what would John Wilkes or Cardinal de Retz have said, to such a false step as Burdett has made, in failing to appear in the procession prepared for him. He has acted in that a more temperate and peaceable part, than I had previously given him credit for; but it is manifest, that his conduct is inconsistent with itself, that all he had done before required him to go on, and that he had advanced too far in the popular race to turn back. His popularity is accordingly very much impaired. The agitators and desperate spirits have had it proved to them, that he is not a leader for them, and has not mettle enough; and the good-hearted mob have found, to their disappointment, that whether it be want of courage, or too good a taste, he will not always enter into all their noise. The more intelligent of his party must be satisfied that he is deficient in resolution, and cannot always be depended on. His powers

of doing mischief are diminished, therefore, if he ever had any mischievous designs, which I do not believe; and if the public were once satisfied that he is no longer popular with the multitude, and thereby formidable, I think he has qualities that would enable him, in his way, to do good occasionally, and to assist other public men in doing good in theirs. Vain he is, no doubt, and always acting upon the suggestions of others, and those often inferior to himself; but he has a prompt indignation against injustice and oppression, one of the best elements of the passion for liberty; and by great and fortunate labour he has acquired a talent for speaking in public. I believe he loves his country and the ancient institutions. I think, too, he has considerable candour in judging of the talents as well as motives of other men; but there have been some symptoms of a very pitiful jealousy, towards those who have interfered with him in his own line of Westminster popularity. He has rendered himself a remarkable man, though I fear he is not likely to do any great or lasting service to the public; his late transactions have extended his popularity beyond the capital, to which it was confined before; but in the end they have lessened it in the capital.'—Ib., pp. 49, 50.

Sir Samuel Romilly's election contest at Bristol in 1812 is amongst the earliest of our youthful recollections. We well remember the admiration he excited, the esteem, amounting in many cases to affection, with which he was regarded, the unwonted enthusiasm awakened on his behalf, and the bitter disappointment which his defeat inflicted. With these remembrances still fresh, we have been much interested by the correspondence which passed between this most estimable and distinguished senator and Mr. Horner immediately after the defeat of the former. 'I hope,' says Mr. Horner, 'you will not decline a seat if any of those who have boroughs should (as I cannot doubt they will) put it in your power. I know your objection to that mode of holding a seat in the House; but as long as the representation continues on its actual footing, I cannot agree that a man who knows he can serve the public ought to refuse that opportunity of serving them.' Sir Samuel acknowledged this communication with the courtesy which it merited, remarking at the close of his letter, 'I certainly have not made up my mind to refuse coming into parliament in the way you mention. My opinion upon that subject is greatly altered, since it has become the only legal way in which to me parliament can be accessible.'

We know not—indeed, we are clearly of opinion—that in the then state of the representation, valid objection could be taken to this decision, at the same time that we congratulate ourselves and the country on the rotten-borough system having been so far destroyed. Much undoubtedly yet remains to be done; but the mighty achievement already effected holds out the promise

of its certain accomplishment. After the triumph of the popular will in the case of the Reform Bill, we need not despair of any triumph, however strongly opposed by aristocratical prejudice and interests.

A brief visit was paid in the summer of 1814 to Jeremy Bentham, then residing at Ford Abbey, in the neighbourhood of Axminster, and the following brief account of the daily avocations of that celebrated man will not be uninteresting to our readers. It occurs in a letter to Miss Anne Horner:—

'There are some handsome rooms, furnished in the taste of King William's time; one of these, very spacious and hung with tapestry, Mr. Bentham has converted into what he calls his 'scribbling shop:' two or three tables are set out, covered with white napkins, on which are placed two or three music desks with manuscripts; his technical memory (I believe), and all the other apparatus of the exhaustive method. I was present at the mysteries, for he went on as if we had not been with him. A long walk, after our breakfast and before his, began the day. He came into the house about one o'clock, the tea things being by that time set by his writing-table, and he proceeded very deliberately to sip his tea, while a young man, a sort of pupil and amanuensis, read the newspapers to him, paragraph by paragraph. This and the tea together seemed gradually to prepare his mind for working, in which he engaged by degrees, and became at last quite absorbed in what was before him, till about five o'clock, when he met us at dinner. He permitted me to sit in the same room, for the purpose of looking over some old volumes which he had found in the house; but I was much more attentive to his own proceedings; this is his daily course throughout the year. Adam, who had never seen him before, was delighted with the suavity and cheerfulness of his manner. Besides the young man I have mentioned, Mr. Cohen, he has living with him Mr. Mill (a gentleman who writes a good deal in the Edinburgh Review,) and his whole family.'—Ib., pp. 179, 180.

So early as 1812 we meet with allusions, in the letters of Mr. Horner's correspondents, to the state of his health, and an increasing anxiety is evinced, lest his numerous engagements should tax too heavily his physical strength. He himself appears to have been entirely free from serious apprehension, and the active part which he took in many of the questions which came before the House of Commons in the early part of 1816, might seem to betoken vigorous health. In a letter to his father, June 5th, he says, 'I am still a little plagued with a cough, in which there is nothing at all material except the circumstance of its continuing so long, which I think is owing to the cold weather. To be quite sure of this, I have (by Lady Holland's desire) seen Dr. Warren, who thinks there is nothing in it, but considers the stomach, as of old, chiefly in fault, and has given me

some directions to observe on that head.' His friends, however, were far from sharing in the indifference with which he treated these ailments. Symptoms of pulmonary affection developed themselves, and he was urged to submit his case to the judgment of eminent medical practitioners. He followed their advice, but this most insidious of human diseases baffled all skill, and speedily terminated his life. It was at length resolved to try the effects of a southern climate, which he announced to Lady Holland on the 30th of September, in terms full of delusive hope.

'Dr. Gregory, with the concurrence of the other physicians, is of opinion that all is sound yet, no harm done, but that care and precaution next winter are indispensably necessary, not only against cold and fatigue, but every degree of exertion. They have positively interdicted me from my profession during the winter, and have strongly advised me to pass the cold months of that season and the spring in a southern climate. I put in a word for two warm rooms at home, in which I promised to confine myself; but they urged the importance of getting to a climate where I might still have open air and regular exercise. That consideration, and a conviction that after this opinion has been delivered by them, my family would feel constant anxiety if I did not follow it, have determined me to go abroad. My brother has offered to go with me, wherever it is; and we shall set out for London on Saturday, where I must be for two or three days, in order to make some necessary arrangements.'—Ib., pp. 343, 344.

Lady Holland's reply to this communication is one of the most beautiful expressions of a kind, and gentle, yet warm-hearted friendship, with which it has been our lot to meet, and, as equally honourable to her ladyship and to Mr. Horner, we should transcribe it if our limits were not already exceeded. Her ladyship would have detained him at Holland-house for the winter, but his medical advisers were decided, and he departed in consequence for Pisa. On the 4th of February, 1817, he informed his father that his health was improving, and expressed the fullest confidence as to the result. 'He at no time appeared to despair of ultimate recovery, and never uttered a word indicating apprehension that he was labouring under a fatal disease; but on more than one occasion he expressed a belief that his recovery would be slow, and that he should have a long interval of repose before he should be able to resume his active duties.' His hopes, however, were wholly illusive, for the disorder under which he was suffering had, at this very time, nearly attained its fatal consummation.

'Two days after he had written the last letter to his father, the difficulty of breathing and the cough reappeared with some severity; on the following morning they were somewhat abated; but towards the

evening they returned, accompanied by drowsiness. I slept in a room next to his own, with an open door between us. In the night I heard him moaning, and on going to him, he said, that he moaned from difficulty of breathing; but that he wished to be left to sleep. I sent for Dr. Vaccà, who came at seven in the morning;—it was Saturday, the 8th of February. He found his patient labouring greatly in his breathing, with strong palpitations of the heart, and a low, intermittent, and irregular pulse; his forehead covered with a cold sweat, and his face and hands of a leaden colour. He was, however, perfectly sensible, and spoke in a clear distinct manner; expressing neither apprehension nor anxiety about himself. Various stimulating applications were tried, but they afforded no relief; the difficulty of breathing gradually increasing.

'Although I had entire confidence in the skill of Dr. Vacca, I requested, towards the afternoon, that there might be a consultation with another physician. They came together soon after four o'clock, and I left the bed-side of the patient, to receive them in the adjoining room; I was absent about ten minutes, and returned alone, to prepare him for seeing the new physician. On drawing aside the curtain, I found his face deadly pale, his eyes fixed, and his hand cold; for a few moments I flattered myself that he had only fainted from weakness; but the sad reality was soon revealed to me,—the precious object of my care was taken from us for ever.'—Ib., pp. 406, 407.

It appeared, from a post-mortem examination which was instituted, that Mr. Horner's disease was not consumption, but 'an enlargement of the air cells, and a condensation of the substance of the lungs.' The case was, therefore, beyond human remedy; and his country was, in consequence, deprived of one of its most generous sons, and an extended circle of friends of one of its brightest ornaments, before the maturity of his powers or of his fame. Such was the subject of these memoirs—a rare compound of intellect and affection.

'His success in the House of Commons,' says the Rev. Sydney Smith, 'was decided and immediate, and went on increasing to the last day of his life. Though put into parliament by one of the great borough lords, every one saw that he represented his own real opinions; without hereditary wealth, and known as a writer in the Edinburgh Review, his independence was never questioned; his integrity, sincerity, and moderation, were acknowledged by all sides, and respected even by those impudent assassins who live only to discourage honesty and traduce virtue. The House of Commons, as a near relation of mine once observed, has more good taste than any man in it. Horner, from his manners, his ability, and his integrity, became a general favourite with the House; they suspended for him their habitual dislike of lawyers, of political adventurers, and of young men of *conseederable taalents* from the North.'—Ib., p. 436.

This is high praise, but not higher than was due. Francis Horner possessed many of the noblest and most winning elements

of our nature, and wanted only one quality to render his character complete. Religion—in its evangelical and personal sense—was absent, and we consequently meet in his letters with a few expressions denotive of hostility to the more vital and spiritual forms of Christianity. What was the special cause of this we know not. It is ours to deplore the fact; while we freely acknowledge, that in the very loveliness and integrity of the character exhibited, we find additional reason to regret that this last perfection of the human mind was not attained.

Art. III. *Des Prisons, et des Prisonniers.* Par le Dr. Vingtrinier, Médecin en chef des Prisons de Rouen, &c. &c. A Versailles. 8vo. 1840.

Dr. Vingtrinier, from whose work upon *Prisons* and *Prisoners* the following details and documents are taken, is advantageously known in France for his persevering pursuit of every improvement calculated to confer lasting correction upon the unhappy victims of vice. During many years he has more particularly devoted attention to the care of *young* criminals, both within the walls of prisons and penitentiaries, and after their discharge from confinement, to which last subject it is intended to limit this article.*

Melancholy as the aspect of every prison is, and wretched as all their inmates are under any circumstances, it is, above all, in the case of the young, that the inevitably demoralizing contact of a gaol is fatal to the mind, and its enervating influence mischievous to the body. The full-grown culprit may already have acquired some habits which counteract the effect of evil associations, and some muscular strength to bear the crushing weight of labour without due motives, or to resist the contagion of even more destructive idleness. But the young, with their eager aptitude to learn, receive in prison the seeds of vice in a hot-bed, and with their tender limbs, which demand the play of the spirits as much as the free air for a full growth, they must, when in confinement, lose all the just proportions that should belong to human beings.

Feeling these things keenly, some benevolent and judicious Frenchmen have devised means of safely shortening the time of imprisonment to young criminals, and of suitably disposing of

* In 1826, Dr. Vingtrinier published a notice upon the prisons of Rouen; in 1828, an Essay on the Reform of Penal Laws; in 1833, an Essay on Lunatics in Prison; in 1839, an Essay on Penitentiaries and Patronage Societies for young Criminals; and in 1840, the volume from which the text is chiefly taken.

them when discharged. This great reform properly applied in other nations, will constitute a brilliant chapter in the records of civilization.

These means are,—inducing well selected families in their own country to receive discharged criminals, and establishing a good system of superintendence over both them and their masters.

This was done at first by the agency of voluntary societies; and of late years, by that of the government in connexion with such societies.

The first trial was made at Strasburg, in 1823. Others followed in Paris, Rouen, Lyons, Bordeaux, and elsewhere. Success has generally attended these efforts, and the system is now in extensive action.

A full detail of the plan and result may be given in a few words, and a rapid view of the progress and present state of prison discipline generally in France, as well as of the treatment of criminals after their discharge, will be useful in England. Each branch of the subject, although it must be legislated upon singly, is connected with other branches of it; and however peculiar some circumstances of each country may be, all have great common bonds with human nature, which lead them to frequent simultaneous action, and render the experience of each invaluable to all.

Dr. Vingtrinier gives a remarkable proof of the truth of this last observation. At the very time that the patriots, whom Thomson panegyrises in the 'Seasons,' and upon whose example the illustrious Howard only improved, were awakening in England the sympathy for prisoners which has prevailed with many unequal results to this day, a Romish preacher, Gros de Besplas, in a sermon before Louis XV., roused the conscience of even a corrupt court in the same cause. Warned by the scenes he had witnessed, when discharging the duties of visitor to capitally condemned criminals, the venerable priest concluded an eloquent discourse by a declaration, that he had seen these wretched beings rejoice at the approach of the hour of execution which was to end their more horrible imprisonment.

This sermon produced a new law, promulgated in 1780, for the reform of the prisons in France; and ever since that year, its successive governments—kingly, republican, imperial, and constitutional—have followed up the effort with various success. The Revolution, too, in filling the prisons of France with crowds of victims belonging to classes little accustomed before to their actual terrors, left deep impressions on the minds of many reflecting men, afterwards restored to power, which have given a strong impetus to the general reform on this head.

The leading improvement was, the building of nineteen vast gaols distributed throughout the country, and filled with prisoners condemned to more than one year's confinement. Work is provided in all these gaols, and they bear the name of *central houses*, 'maisons centrales,' with a view to the substitution of the idea of *penitentiary labour* for that of mere incarceration.

These nineteen gaols are distinct from the prisons in which people are confined for less than one year, and before trial. The other prisons are,—first, *police* stations, in which drunken people and others are confined for a night before being taken to the magistrate; secondly, the prisons to which people are committed for trial, and immediately after sentence; and thirdly, prisons with various wards, not extending to the purposes of the *central houses*.

At Rouen, the prison of this third class described by Dr. Vingtrinier in detail, has distinct wards for debtors—for people committed for trial—for criminals condemned to one year's imprisonment—for young criminals—and for military culprits.

In all these prisons much remains to be done, notwithstanding all that has been accomplished. In some of them, says Dr. Vingtrinier, exactly the same system is applied to men convicted of the blackest crimes, and to those who have only committed what we term *misdemeanors;* and often well managed prisons, in which great criminals are passing ten or twenty years' incarceration, are better provided with comforts than the gaol to which an individual is committed for trial, who may be acquitted of any offence. He appeals earnestly for a wise uniformity of plan that shall remove all such imperfections.

But he enlarges more earnestly, and at greater length, on another very important point. After a long struggle, the hard treatment of prisoners in former days was condemned by all thinking men, and is supposed to be abandoned for ever by the government in France. Within the last twelve years, however, a new spirit has arisen, and *severity* is again proclaimed as the true principle of prison discipline. Once it was a settled opinion, that under the more moderate system, crime sensibly diminished. The criminals in France, who in 1818 amounted to 2569 in number, were in fact reduced to 1622 in 1825. New inquiries were next asserted to have proved, that crime increased through the attractions of the improved prisons. *Hence the more modern system of solitary confinement and hard diet.*

The same fluctuation of opinion has taken place in England and in the United States, and with the same results.

Dr. Vingtrinier denies the correctness of the calculations, upon the credit of which it is asserted that crime has increased; and expatiates with great force of argument and of illustration upon

the evils of the modern system of *severity*. In its place he would set,—first, employment for criminals, vigilantly superintended; secondly, good penitentiaries; and thirdly, frequent pardons. He would thus bring into action all that tends to *invite* criminals to behave well; and he would abolish all that prevents their reform by crushing their hopes. He insists that the history of prisons and of criminals in France proves this to be the only sound and statesmanlike view of the case.

These principles of Dr. Vingtrinier are at the bottom of the plan of *protection for young criminals*, which is now to be described almost in the words of the respectable author. It is a plan exceedingly well worth the attention of those numerous persons in all parts of the United Kingdom, who watch with anxiety the condition of this unhappy class of our population.

The separation of young criminals from adults in prison is now universally admitted to be indispensable. *Their separation from each other*, and their restoration to the ordinary advantages of society, without being exposed to the corruptions of *their own* families, are points which have not yet obtained sufficient attention. It is not doubted by any, that in many cases, some term of imprisonment is necessary for the correction of young criminals; and the improvement of prisons for them has not been unsuccessful. But after having passed through the best managed penitentiary, the difficulty arises, how they may be well disposed of. This difficulty has been found to be the greater in the common cases in which young criminals have been confined in ill-managed prisons. And it has further been felt to be most embarrassing in the frequent cases in which, by a peculiarity in the French code,* young persons under the age of sixteen are declared by the judge to have acted 'without discernment.' These young people are required to be acquitted on the trial, but they are either to be sent home to their parents, *or to be confined in a house of correction* for terms not extending beyond the age of twenty.

All these classes are substantially those for whom much anxiety is felt in England under the names of 'young criminals' and 'juvenile offenders;' and for whom respectively transportation and colonization have been provided.

In 1832, the French minister of public works adopted the new system of protection, or patronage, for such young criminals, by placing them early in private families; and in a circular of that year, addressed to all the departments, the foundation and character of this new system are fully described:

'A prison, it is there said, can *never* be a good school for the

* Article 66.

young. Yet, as it is the children of the poor who for the most part commit crimes, they ought, even when condemned, to be brought up so as to be able to earn a livelihood. In prisons in which there are no workshops, this is impossible. In those in which the shops must be such as will give immediate and profitable employment to the other prisoners, a proper duration of apprenticeship is also impossible; besides, the trades being necessarily of the simplest kind, they can teach little. In addition to these objections, a prison education, however carefully conducted, shuts the young out of the world which they are to live in, and cuts them off from all experience of the ties they are to respect. It confines them also to criminal companions, which alone is a great evil. Among those companions, some must be found of unusual perverseness of character, and able to do incalculable mischief, almost unchecked, to the rest.

'These are great moral objections to the long imprisonment of young criminals.

'But it is further an immense disadvantage to shut up *growing* people in their youth, when exercise and the free air are indispensable to the development of those limbs, by the strength of which they are to gain their bread.

'The remedy for these evils is, to place young criminals, as soon as possible, in the families of farmers, or tradesmen willing for a money payment to receive them as apprentices. Trials already made of this plan in several departments, recommend it for more extensive use. Its advantages are undeniable. It separates ill-disposed young people from each other. It gives them the incomparably better education of a family, and the best instruction under a master's care. Above all, when they behave well, it gives them kind friends.

'The good character of the families to which they are to go is the first point to be established to the satisfaction of the authorities. The engagement must be subject to be cancelled, under certain specific circumstances, at the option of the authorities—and also at the will of the master. Especially if it be found proper to restore the young offender to his own family, provision must be made to allow of that step. During the whole term of apprenticeship also, he must be liable to be remanded to prison upon the solemn committal of a judicial officer.

'The term of this apprenticeship is to be until the age of twenty, so that the apprentice may have time to learn his trade, and the master have the fair benefit of his improved skill and labour.

'A fee is to be paid to the master with these apprentices, under certain equitable conditions for its repayment, if the engagement happen to be broken.

'The contracts must be submitted to the approval of more than one of the authorities, and in case of any doubt, reference must be made to the minister's office.

'After the young criminal shall be placed in the selected family, a regular superintendence over his conduct and treatment must be followed up by the local authorities.

'The expense of these proceedings is to be provided for out of specific funds; and copies of all documents concerning these proceedings are sent to the office of the minister, whose circular is here set forth.'

Annexed to the document from which the foregoing statement is taken, is a contract of apprenticeship of a boy of fifteen years of age, to a farmer. The engagement is, to employ the boy in such agricultural work, suited to his age, strength, and intelligence, as the farmer may think fit; and to feed him in health and sickness, provide him lodging, candles, fire, clothing, and washing, and otherwise treat him as a member of the family. On arriving, he was to have from the government a suit of clothes, linen, and shoes, with 1*l.* 8*s.* sterling; and within one year from the date of the contract, the master was to receive 2*l.* from the government.

The conditions for cancelling the engagement are—

1. Proved ill-treatment of the apprentice by the master; insufficient food, no domestic care, or bad teaching of the business.
2. Misconduct by the apprentice.
3. A judgment by a competent authority, or the requisition of the apprentice's parents.
4. The requisition of the Attorney-General.

In case of the engagement being cancelled under the second, third, or fourth articles, the fee of 2*l.* must be paid to the master.

At the end of the term, the master must give the apprentice a good character in writing, if he deserves it.

Since the issuing of the minister's circular, the proofs of the utility of the system have been abundant. In one town, Alençon, which did not enjoy the advantage of a regular penitentiary, fifteen boys, of whom twelve were convicted of theft, were apprenticed in this way; and three only ever committed a fresh offence. In Lyons, where, besides the superintendence of the government, and an active *society* of *protection*, or patronage, there is a remarkably good penitentiary, twenty-nine out of forty of the apprenticed criminal boys were traced in the following satisfactory way. Twenty-two of the twenty-nine were conducting themselves well in their places; six had gone back to their families, and one was set up as a working glazier on his own account. Of the remaining eleven, one had died, three had committed fresh offences, and seven had absconded; but two of the last seem to

have satisfied their masters. In Rouen the result has not been so satisfactory as in Lyons, thirty-five out of ninety-four cases having failed, or thirty-seven per cent. in Rouen, whereas in Lyons the failures were only twenty per cent.

Dr. Vingtrinier accounts for the difference by a careful comparison of the *penitentiary* systems pursued in the two places; upon which it is not intended to enter in this article, and also by a comparison of the different modes of applying the operations of the protection or patronage societies in them, which will be specially noticed.

In Rouen, a portion only of the young criminals—namely, those above sixteen years of age, have been apprenticed; which Dr. Vingtrinier considers to be a fatal error.

In Lyons, on the contrary, all the young criminals are apprenticed out as soon as possible after being put into prison.

In Rouen, the government authorities, and the protection, or patronage society, *do not pull together vigorously* to carry the new system out.

In Lyons, the most active co-operation exists between them.

These circumstances amply explain the advantage which Lyons has over Rouen in this matter, although some points in Dr. Vingtrinier's statement deserve further elucidation in reference to particular reasons for the Rouen failure; and he is justified in his zealous appeal to his own townsmen, and to France at large, to devote increased pains to a system which promises the greatest benefits to society, and which is in harmony with all our best feelings. It is most unwise, he urges, to set up vast prisons to teach every variety of trade to young criminals, as has been advocated in France, and tried elsewhere; or agricultural colonies of thousands of the same class, as others have proposed, against the apprenticeship and protection plan. Those prisons and colonies leave an increasing criminal population upon our hands, but the apprenticeships and superintending protection disperse it safely and improvingly over the surface of society at large.

The well-known distinctions between the French codes and English law are no impediments to the adoption of the foregoing system in England; and the inquiries necessary to be made in order to ascertain more of its working in France, and to determine whether any circumstances in the condition of our towns, or country, are opposed to its adoption, might be set on foot without difficulty. The reward of its successful introduction into England, would not only be the improvement of the prospects of young criminals, but the principle once well established in their case, might be extended to condemned criminals of every class, and of all ages; when an end would be put to the abomination of convict colonization; and our gaols at home would become, in

most cases, places of simple restraint to the perverse criminal, and of corrective introduction of the repentant to hopeful employment.

The subject of this article is not absolutely new in England; and some circumstances familiar to those who have attended to prison discipline among us are favourable to the adoption of the system which succeeds so well in France. But the whole plan will, we believe, be found to have much of novelty in it; and its bearing upon several most serious questions is important enough to justify the demand that it be not rejected without grave consideration.

Art. IV. *A Memoir of the Life and Ministry of the late Rev. Watts Wilkinson, B.A., with Extracts from his Correspondence.* By Henry Watts Wilkinson, M.A. London: Seeleys. 1842.

This brief memoir, occupying not more than seventy-eight pages, is introductory to one sermon, two outlines of sermons, and a large collection of more than one hundred and eighty letters. Of the memoir we have little to say, more than that it is an affectionate tribute of filial piety, written with much modesty and simplicity, and interspersed with such reflections on the few events recorded as could not but occur to an enlightened and religious mind. Several facts are recorded which afford the writer an opportunity—of which he has availed himself with an earnestness perhaps becoming his profession as a clergyman of the church of England—for expressing his dislike of what he calls 'the disloyalty and factiousness of *modern* dissenters.'

The Rev. Watts Wilkinson was descended from presbyterian ancestors in the north. His great-grandfather was the Rev. Robert Blunt, M.A., of Trinity College, Cambridge, and vicar of Kirke Harle, in Northumberland. Mr. Blunt was ejected from his living by the statute of uniformity, in the year 1662; and though he was prosecuted and excommunicated for continuing to discharge his ministry, he escaped in a surprising manner out of the hands of his enemies, and continued preaching every Lord's day, while writs were issued against him, term after term, by the Archdeacon of Durham. In 1672 he obtained a licence to preach; but that being soon recalled, he was outlawed and fined 30*l.* in the Exchequer. Still he continued preaching to a poor country people in the night. In 1682 he settled with a congregation at Horsely, near Newcastle-on-Tyne, where he continued his ministerial labours till within two years of his death, in 1716, aged ninety-two.*

* See Palmer's Nonconformist's Memorial, vol. iii., p. 75.

Mr. Wilkinson's father having left Northumberland, and settled in London early in life, became a member of the congregation of Dr. John Guyse, the well known author of a paraphrase and notes on the New Testament. Mr. W. Wilkinson, the subject of this memoir, was born in London in 1755. His days of childhood were marked by the signs of a tender conscience and of religious feelings so usual in pious families, awakened in his case by the Assembly's catechism, deepened by the death of an infant brother, and frequently revived by the appeals of the pastor's ministry. When about seventeen years old, he was induced by a friend (who afterwards became a rector in Suffolk) to surmount his 'violent prejudices' against the establishment, and attend one of the Friday evening lectures of the Rev. H. Foster, at St. Antholin's Church. The sermon (from 2 Cor. ii. 11) was the means of his conversion, and he continued to attend the ministrations of the preacher, in whom he found a kind friend, as well as a faithful pastor. He soon expressed a desire to devote himself to the ministry, and thinking that a larger field of usefulness was presented to him in the established church than amongst dissenters, he tried to persuade himself that he might take orders with a good conscience; he examined the objections to the church which he found in the writings of some dissenters, and came to the natural result, that his former prejudices had been groundless. After availing himself of the best means of classical instruction within his reach, he entered as a Commoner at Worcester College, Oxford, in 1776. He spent great part of his long vacations at Olney, where he enjoyed the ministry and the friendship of the Rev. John Newton. To the friendship of another eminent clergyman, the Rev. R. Cecil, he was indebted for an introduction to the Rev. Michael Marlow, chaplain of Aske's Hospital, Hoxton, and father of the lady who afterwards became his wife. Having graduated at Oxford, he was ordained by Dr. Lowth, Bishop of London, in 1779, as curate of Little Horton, Bucks. He began his public ministry at the church of St. Anne, Blackfriars, of which his friend and spiritual father, the Rev. H. Foster, was at that time lecturer. The subject of his sermon was 'the conversion of Manasseh.' He continued his curacy, till, at the close of the year, he was appointed, by a large majority of votes, to the afternoon lectureship of the united parishes of St. Mary, Aldermary, and St. Thomas the Apostle, London. He was shortly afterwards chosen to be the successor of his father-in-law, as chaplain of Aske's Hospital. Soon after this appointment, he married Miss Marlow, and took up his abode in the house appropriated to the chaplain of the hospital. The clerical charge at the hospital being but light, his time was mainly devoted to

preparation for his three sermons on Sundays. The most approved commentators, the older puritan divines, and especially Archbishop Leighton, engaged his unremitting study. In the course of years, his afternoon lectures were addressed to large auditories in the 'capacious church' of St. Mary, Aldemary, and the small chapel at the hospital became crowded, a large proportion of his hearers being constant communicants.

For a short time he became the evening lecturer in the church of St. Antholin, Watling-street, the place in which he had heard the gospel with so much spiritual benefit; but this situation he resigned on obtaining the morning lectureship at St. Bartholomew, by the Exchange. To this lecture at mid-day, in the very heart of commerce, crowded congregations were attracted from all parts of the metropolis, and occasionally from all parts of the country.

'The contrast between the scene without and within the church was peculiarly striking. *Outside*, a dense multitude of persons, apparently in eager pursuit of those things which are seen and temporal, deeply engaged in their worldly business, intent upon the acquisition of earthly riches, walking in a vain show, and disquieting themselves in vain, amidst the noise and bustle of carriages innumerable passing to and fro in every direction. *Within* the walls of the sacred edifice, a crowded congregation engaged in divine service, apparently in pursuit of those things which are unseen and eternal, seeking after heavenly riches, the kingdom of God, and his righteousness, listening to the words of eternal truth, the cheering promises of the gospel, proclaimed by the lips of one who was deeply conscious of his near approach to the invisible and eternal world, and spoke out of the abundance of his heart, from his own experience of the lovingkindness of Jehovah, during a period of little less than seventy years. Could any contrast be more striking?'—pp. 41, 42.

The following extract from a letter addressed by Sir William Knighton, physician in ordinary to his late Majesty King George the Fourth, to Lady Knighton, will afford an interesting illustration of the above statement:—

'*Athenæum, January* 5, 1836.

'I am just returned from hearing old Mr. Wilkinson in the city. I think he must be above eighty, quite clear and distinct. A beautiful old church, thronged to fulness. I could only just get in, and stand at the door. I was not in time for his text. I should think it was on 'Regeneration.' The first words I heard from him were, 'Remember that the day of death is the day of judgment.' He then said, 'It has been truly stated that there were three joyous periods in the history of man. The first was the day of his conversion, when the finger of God, by his Holy Spirit, writes on the heart of man the comfortable assurance,—Thy sins are forgiven thee, by the redeeming blood of thy Saviour Jesus Christ. Under such circumstances, the

next joyous day is the day of our death, when all the miseries our mortal flesh is heir to terminate; and then comes the third period of our joy,—namely, our ascension into heaven.' This gentleman has the most striking countenance you ever saw. What a beautiful picture might be made of him, and of the marvellous variety of careworn faces, for it is near to the Exchange, by which his pulpit is surrounded.'—*Memoirs of Sir William Knighton*, vol. ii., p. 441.

His last sermon at St. Bartholomew's was on the 28th of April, 1840, after which time, the church, which contained the remains of Bishop Coverdale, and which had been the scene of Mr. Wilkinson's interesting and useful labours for nearly thirty years, was doomed to destruction: a few months later in the same year, he closed his public ministry at St. Mary, Aldermary. On his return home from his last public service, in which he had suffered greatly from a distressing cough, he expressed for the first time his apprehension that he should never preach again. During fourteen weeks of increasing infirmity and pain, he reviewed his private walk and his public labours, and ministered by his sweet example, as well as by his words, to the instruction and edification of his family and friends.

'It ought to be particularly observed how entirely he repudiated the unscriptural inferences which many persons have drawn from those sublime doctrines which he constantly exhibited and appealed to during his public ministry. On one occasion, in particular, not many evenings before his death, when expressing to one of his sons his apprehension that he should not survive the night, and at the same time his simple dependence on the mercy of God in Christ, as if his mind was still dwelling on these topics, though no one present had attempted to bring them to his remembrance, he emphatically observed, '*There is no such thing as reprobation* ;' and after alluding to the opinion of President Edwards upon that subject, in a manner which plainly evinced the collected state of his mind, he immediately, with much solemnity and emphasis, quoted the following words:—'The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth.'—p. 53.

The record of his final scenes on earth is given with touching simplicity, and it is happily in keeping with the uniform tenour of his character and labours. It affords a most beautiful and precious illustration of the elementary truths of the gospel as the hope and consolation of a venerable saint and minister, after the experience of nearly seventy years. 'On the night but one before his death, he was heard to say, 'Christ is worth more than ten thousand worlds.' One word more was heard from him; he repeated three times—*Name, name, name;* and what could have been in his mind but *that* name to which he had so often borne

witness, but which he had not then power to articulate, even that name which is above every name, besides which, there is 'none other given among men whereby we must be saved.' A gentle slumber followed; an affectionate daughter stood watching beside him, and observed how sweetly he appeared to sleep, how freely he breathed. In a few minutes she thought the breath had ceased; she listened intently, she could not be mistaken, it was even so. He was 'absent from the body, and present with the Lord,' even with that Saviour whom he so ardently loved, and so faithfully served. Without a pang, or a sigh, or the least emotion, the great, and to him, most glorious change, took place about eleven o'clock on Monday, the 16th day of December, 1840.

From the perusal of this memoir, combined with other testimonies, and aided by some personal recollections, we may present to our readers a faithful portrait of the private and public character of this amiable and excellent servant of Christ. No small part of the charm of his ministry was owing, we believe, to the striking countenance which so deeply impressed Sir William Knighton, and which no one who has seen can ever forget. In his later years, his aspect united the brightness of a happy heart, with the serene and chastened dignity of a grave and solemn office, in a degree which we have never seen equalled. He had the appearance of a man who lived *in* the pulpit, and *for* the pulpit, and who discharged its duties with a clear sight of the eternal world. Without the appearance of any kind of affectation, and seemingly unconscious of the singular popularity which he enjoyed for so many years, there was a simplicity in his whole manner which was inexpressibly delightful. Retired and unostentatious in his private habits, he mingled little with society, took no share in the public and busy movements of the Christian world, but came forth ever fresh from his closet to the labours of the pulpit, as one whose 'life was hid with Christ in God,' whose 'conversation was in heaven,' and whose heart was in his work. With no great comprehension, acuteness, or brilliancy of intellect, and giving scarcely any indications, either of the research, the imagination, or the passion which constitute the elements of eloquence, his discourses were rich in evangelical truth, in spiritual unction, and in tender earnestness, always plain, unassuming, and consolatory. To the spiritually-minded hearer, to the lover of decidedly Calvinistic doctrine, to the sorrowful, tempted, or anxious, his ministry was felt to be peculiarly attractive, and was gratefully acknowledged to be practically useful. It might be objected, we think not without reason, that in his discourses there was a want of mental power; that there was a too constant

recurrence to the same topics, however evangelical; that there was an undue prominence given to the merely consolatory portions of the Scripture, and that the comforting of believers was made too *nearly* exclusive in his aim. Amongst the crowds that might be seen hanging on his lips, there would usually be found a large proportion of professors belonging to various churches, to whom all these features of his ministry constituted their special charm; they repaired to him for that 'food,' as such persons express it, which they complained they could not gather from their ordinary teachers. That Mr. Wilkinson loved souls, that he preached from the heart, that he was richly imbued with Scriptural knowledge, that he had ever before him the solemnities of the last judgment, and the sublime issues of eternity, none who heard him could doubt; and to have maintained the position which he did maintain, amid the changes of this great and fickle city for more than sixty years, is a noble instance almost without parallel in the history of the Christian pulpit.

The sermon appended to this memoir, is not given as a specimen of the preacher's ordinary style, but 'as one that will be read with much interest by his friends, in consequence of its being the first sermon he delivered in the church of St. Mary, Aldermary,' and as indicating the manner in which he commenced a ministry in that church, which he was permitted to continue without interruption for the remarkable period of nearly sixty-one years.

It is a clear, faithful, well-composed discourse on 'Search the Scriptures.' After an appropriate introduction from the context, illustrating the *condescension* of our Lord's teaching, he takes for granted the inspiration of the Sacred Records, and proceeds to shew—

'1. What is to search the Scriptures, implying the greatest diligence and earnestness; an earnest desire to discover the truth, and earnest prayer to God for his blessing, and the aid of his Spirit to enlighten the understanding.

'2. He points out the encouragement we have to this duty, in their contents, and in the Saviour's command.

'3. He shows the blessed effect which we have reason to hope will follow this conduct, which is no less than 'eternal life.' He applies the discourse, by amplifying the following pertinent and pungent queries—'Does not the exhortation in my text, convict many of a most essential fault and neglect? Will not their condemnation be just who neglect the Scriptures? How precious ought this precious book to be unto us?' A book which contains everything calculated to promote our happiness here and hereafter; a book which reveals those glorious truths of the gospel, which have supported the people of God from the beginning, and will be their support and comfort to the con-

summation of all things. These blessed truths animated the confessors of old, and inspired the martyrs with courage, so that they rejoiced even in the prospect of a cruel and agonizing death; and these truths now inspire the heart of every follower of Jesus, with unfeigned love and gratitude to his divine Lord and Saviour. Can we give a greater proof of depravity than by despising such a book?

'Prize it, my friends, above your necessary food. Bear with me, while I entreat you, by everything that is sacred, or that is dear to you, if you love your own souls, if you desire eternal happiness, or fear eternal misery, '*search the Scriptures*,' as the means of avoiding the one, and obtaining the other.

'Lastly: Ought we not to love that precious Saviour who lays this command upon us, and who is himself the sum and substance of the Scriptures.'—pp. 92, 93.

After Mr. Wilkinson had concluded his public ministry, he composed two plans of sermons, which he did not live to preach; but which are published in this volume. They are able specimens of the art of preparing public discourses, and abound in just and happy thoughts. The numerous letters which fill up the remainder of the volume are not easily classified, and though we cannot select many passages of peculiar interest, we have no doubt that in reading them, the pious heart will be much cheered by the truly spiritual tone, the affection, the constant reference to God, and the deep humility by which they are pervaded.

We should not feel that we had discharged our duty to our readers, if we allowed our observations on this volume to close without one or two gentle, yet faithful, animadversions on some portions of it which contain references either by the subject, or by the author of the memoir, to the principles or practices of protestant dissenters. We know of no terms more expressive of the tone of these references, than *ignorant horror*. It may serve the temporary purposes of a timid party to represent the dissenters—with a nauseous monotony of repetition—as men who would turn religion into rebellion, and faith into faction! who are not loyal to the Crown, who are allied with papists for a political purpose, with a view to the subversion of the established church, 'the main bulwark of protestantism as well as of sound doctrine in our beloved land.'

But is it either discourteous, or, in the Christian sense, uncharitable, to affirm, as we now plainly do, that all this style of writing betrays a lamentable want of information, candour, or integrity, by whomsoever it is adopted, and by whomsoever it is encouraged? We would request the pious editor of these remains, either to understand the dissenters or to leave them alone. We assure him, from an acquaintance with the writings and doings of dissenters, more extensive than any which he would profess, that their loyalty, love of protestantism, and attachment

to sound doctrine, will bear to be compared with those displayed by the highest ornaments of the church, in which he fancies these principles are exclusively preserved; and further, that we will undertake to *prove*, that the conservation of evangelical truth in our own country, has been owing, under God, to those very principles of which he seems to be so much afraid. This is a matter deserving the serious attention of all parties, more specially of all lovers of 'sound doctrine,' in whatever community they may be found; but we have not space, in a cursory paper like the present, for treating it with the fulness of illustration and the length of argument to which it is so justly entitled.

We are amused,—certainly not affected in any more serious way,—at the manner in which the unpractised writer unfolds the process of his father's conversion to the established church. After introducing what he calls more properly than he perhaps intended, 'a *little* anecdote' about strolling into a church-yard, he treats us with a *little* note on the 'wilful and obstinate prejudice of dissenters against the office for the burial of the dead.' . . . He then tells us, with most edifying gravity, that his father was convinced 'that the New Testament contains no argument in favour of the Independent or Congregational mode of church government; and that he was strongly opposed to its fundamental principle, that spiritual authority to dispense God's holy word and sacraments is to be derived *solely* from *the call* of a society of professing Christians; and that he considered lay preaching to be liable to many serious objections;' that he was uniformly attached to the formularies of the church of England; that he regarded the Athanasian creed as one of the most excellent parts of the liturgy; that most of all he admired the office for the administration of the Lord's Supper; and that he cordially approved of the injunction that '*the consecrated elements** of the body and blood of Christ should be received kneeling; that he never deviated from strict conformity to the liturgy, or infringed in any respect the laws and regulations of the church.

Now all we have to say to these elaborate assurances on points which, for aught we can see, might have been fairly taken

* We should be glad to know in what precise sense, and for what reason this word, 'elements,' is applied to the bread and wine of the Eucharist. In Johnson's Dictionary the word 'element' is defined—1. The part or constituent principle of anything. 2. The four elements usually so called. 3. The proper habitation or sphere of anything, as water, of fish. 4. An ingredient, a constituent part. 5. The letters of any language. 6. The lowest or first rudiments of literature or science. We suspect that the use of this word, in application to the Lord's Supper, is full of mystery, mystification, superstition, or *no sense*.

for granted, is this. There are thousands of equally wise, pious, and conscientious men in England who believe that the office for the burial of the dead, *taken as a whole*, is objectionable when used so indiscriminately as it notoriously is. Some of these men, moreover, have proved, *out of the writings of church of England clergymen*, that the New Testament does contain solid and irrefragable arguments for the congregational mode of church government. We can inform the Rev. writer that what he condemns as the fundamental principle of that government, is no principle nor portion of it.

We could fill many melancholy pages with proofs of the 'ill consequences resulting from clerical preaching.' Not only has it evinced a tendency to bring the ministry into contempt, but has surrounded that ministry, in many thousands of instances, with the sighs of the devout, and the ruined souls of the deceived. We must add, that the *cordial* attachment of such men as the venerable minister whose remains are now before us, to all the superstition, formality, and submission to human authority, prescribed by the political rulers of the church of England, has done more than all the efforts of the dreaded dissenters to damage her, by enfeebling what is good, and by strengthening what is evil in that so much lauded engine *for forcing of religion on our people.*

Art. V. *The Modern Judea, Ammon, Moab, and Edom, compared with Ancient Prophecy. With Notes and Engravings illustrative of Biblical subjects.* By the Rev. J. A. Wylie, Dollar. 12mo. pp. 576. Glasgow: Collins.

It is only within our own age that clear and comprehensive knowledge of the Holy Land has been accessible to the public. Curiosity concerning its state and the locality of its sacred scenes has never, indeed, been extinct in the civilized world, from the day when its religion challenged the inquiry, and demanded the faith of mankind. It may seem passing strange, that with the eyes of all Christendom, intent through so many ages upon this limited territory, so little should have been ascertained, and so much mistaken or utterly unknown. Yet so it is; until within the present century, it was not possible to acquire, even by the most diligent reading and patient investigation, a satisfactory acquaintance with the birth place of our religion, or the land traversed by the feet of our Emmanuel, and made famous by the deeds of his benevolence.

Many causes might be assigned for the incertitude of all that was related beyond the barest outlines of its geography and an-

tiquities. The very interest which Palestine has always excited in Christendom, has been either directly or indirectly the means of prompting superstition to fabricate its fables, and pass off its ignorance for exact knowledge. For many ages all information respecting this country was derived through this channel, and partook of its colouring. The extraordinary and perpetual revolutions to which it has been subject from the time of its people's fall; the decline of civilization, both in it and the neighbouring countries; the incurable vices of Mohammedan government, and the irreconcilable antipathies of the three principal parties, Jews, Turks, and Christians, who have all along been struggling either to gain, or keep, or regain the possession of Palestine, have been among the chief impediments to the acquisition of sound and complete knowledge of this pre-eminently interesting country.

Turkish jealousy of European curiosity has but recently subsided, so far as to afford facilities to travellers, and extend protection to men of science from other countries; for, of course, all the interest felt in the Holy Land is by foreigners. But thanks to Mehemet Ali; he has made his authority to be respected, and his power to be feared, by the most lawless of the Bedouins; so that, though there is not universal and absolute security against plundering banditti and official extortion and oppression, yet there is incomparably more security for person and property, at least of European travellers having lawful permission, than for many centuries past. Hence the vast improvement which has taken place in all works relating to this country within the last fifteen or twenty years. The difficulties, both of travelling and of gaining information, are now greatly diminished; and there can be no doubt that this is mainly owing to the comparatively enlightened views and energetic rule of the present Pacha. Indeed little more can be expected while Syria remains in its present political condition. Under Moslem dominion there is no hope of a thorough renovation. The social condition of the people cannot be materially improved while evils such as the following prevail—degrading ignorance and superstition among the nominally Christian, fatalism and tyranny among the Musselmen, and powerless revenge or moping melancholy among the Jews. There is no unity to be found throughout the land and among the different classes of its inhabitants; there is no sense of the value of knowledge, no respect for their rulers, no *heart* in anything—for there is neither science, patriotism, nor religion. These appear at present to be insuperable obstacles to further improvements; and yet the land itself still possesses all the means and appliances whereby a united people might raise themselves to dignity, independence, and happiness. The volume

which we have now to introduce to the notice of our readers is altogether a very seasonable and very satisfactory one. It may be described as a judicious summary derived, by laborious comparison and careful analysis, from all the best works which either ancient or modern authors have produced upon the subject. Although appearing so nearly about the same time as Robinson and Smith's great work, it cannot be expected to contain all the information conveyed by that last and best of books upon Palestine, yet the author has availed himself of the outline of their discoveries which those travellers first published in the American Biblical Repository.

The plan of this stay-at-home traveller was, first to make an imaginary itinerary over all the principal districts, and to introduce his readers to the most remarkable and interesting scenes, and then to exhibit the fulfilment of ancient prophecy in the present condition of the different contiguous countries of Judea, Ammon, Moab, and Edom. The work is, therefore, adapted not only to gratify the curiosity of the reader by a minute description of the most interesting of regions, but to confirm his faith in divine revelation, by showing how the testimony of every traveller, whether an infidel or a Christian, has contributed to prove the marvellous fulfilment of the most singular and discriminating prophecies, which are attached to the several sections of the land, and which may be said to be stereotyped for the instruction of the world in the present and long unaltered condition both of the country and its inhabitants, so that the words of ancient prophecy concerning them severally might be engraved upon the face of their respective rocks, and be read by every visitor as an emphatic, but exact description of the doom that has long been upon them, and which an overruling providence has not suffered to be materially changed by all the marvellous revolutions and convulsions which have transpired during eighteen centuries.

The following extract will afford our readers a concise view of the social condition of Judea, and at the same time illustrate the striking fulfilment of prophecy in the fearful and protracted desolations of the 'delightsome land.'

'We shall now turn our attention to the various changes which Judea has undergone, and the character of the successive governments under which she has existed, for the purpose of inquiring whether the prophecy has, in this respect, been fulfilled. *I will give it into the hands of the strangers for a prey.* '*Destruction cometh, and they shall seek place, and there shall be none. Mischief shall come upon mischief, rumour shall be upon rumour.*'—Ezek. vii. 25, 26. Since the hour the Temple fell, the history of the country is a continued series of disasters. Seldom has plague, or famine, or war, been absent from her

borders; and how often do we find her suffering from all these scourges combined. The various masters, under whose yoke she has successively passed, have studied only to oppress her. When the government of her own princes came to an end, she was converted into a Roman province. From the Romans she passed under the dominion of the Persians. She soon, however, returned to her former masters, under whose authority she continued till the seventh century, when she was finally wrested from the successors of Cæsar by the arms of the Saracens. In the beginning of the twelfth century her fields were desolated by the soldiers of Europe, who, impelled by a furious zeal, rushed to Palestine to rescue, as they said, the country from the infidels, but in reality to accomplish the woes which prophecy denounced against that unhappy land; and to Judea the religious bigotry of the west was as fatal as the keen sabres and fiery valour of the east. The fury of the crusaders in due time exhausted itself; but the hour of peace and security came not to this torn and distracted land. The measure of her woes was not yet full. After the Christians were driven out of her, more ruthless conquerors appeared upon the stage. Judea now fell under the dominion of the Mamelukes of Egypt. From their hands she passed, in 1516, into the possession of Selim, Emperor of the Ottoman Turks, whose swords extended the limits of his kingdom to the Libyan desert. Under the Sultans of this race has Judea continued for upwards of three hundred years, with no interruptions, save what has been occasioned from time to time, by the insurrections of rebellious pachas. The facts we have stated offer a clear fulfilment of the prophecy. Rumour has followed rumour; destruction has come upon destruction. No sooner has one cloud discharged its 'pitiless shower' of ills, than another of seven-fold blackness has gathered in the sky. Of the land, as well as of the people, we may say, in the words of Moses, 'thou shalt be only oppressed and crushed alway.'

'*I will give it to the wicked of the earth for a spoil, and they shall pollute it.*'—Ezek. vii. 21. This prediction has assuredly been fulfilled. When we review the long catalogue of masters under whose power Judea has fallen, we know not one of them to whom the epithet 'wicked' does not apply, and who have not acted as the prophecy foretold they would—'spoiled' the land by their oppression, and 'polluted' it by their armies. Since the hour the sun of her freedom set, the baleful stars of tyranny and superstition have beamed upon her from a darkened sky. When shall we find more fitting terms than those the prophet has furnished us with, by which to designate the government under which she presently (*at present*) exists—perhaps the most unprincipled, tyrannical, and avaricious on the face of the earth. In other countries the end of government is to maintain order, to encourage industry, to punish fraud, to repress crime, to reward obedience; but here government exists for no end apparently but to oppress and plunder those over whom it rules. Its head resides at Constantinople; and over each district is set a pacha. The appointment is given to the highest bidder; and, as gain is the only motive which leads any

one to assume the office, and, as the term during which it may be exercised, is short, the pacha endeavours to reap in a day the fruit of years. He regards the country he governs as his own private property, and his subjects as his slaves. His soldiers are ready to execute any command, however cruel or rapacious; and though often guilty of the greatest atrocities, the seat of the supreme authority is too remote, the influence of the pacha in his own district, as well as at the head of government, is too great to allow of any one, however grievously he may have been wronged, bringing him to justice. The result of this tyranny on agriculture and trade is just what might have been expected; it has reduced them to the lowest state compatible with the existence of the beings who live on the soil. The husbandman sows only what may suffice to feed him, and the artisan performs only so much work as may preserve his family from starving. To convey their efforts beyond this limit, were only to labour for their oppressor. 'O fatal despotism,' exclaims Mariti, when surveying the waste which Sharon now exhibits, 'thou causest sterility where nature placed abundance; thou enchainest the faculties of man, and buriest population in the bosom of the earth!' Volney has confirmed the prophet in a very remarkable manner. '*I will give it to the wicked of the earth for a spoil,*' said the prophet. 'The Turks,' says the traveller, 'consider the country only as the spoil of a conquered enemy.'

'An individual picture always affects us more than a general statement—the atrocities of one more than the atrocities of a thousand continued through as many years. We shall therefore present the reader with a brief sketch of one of the officers of the 'wicked' government. The name we are about to mention was long the terror of Palestine, and was well known to every traveller in the East; and certainly no ordinary measure of wickedness could have gained so great distinction, in so long and dark a list of tyrants, for the name of Djezzar Pacha. The term signifies 'the butcher;' and this not very enviable title he acquired by his manifold barbarities and murders. He was originally a Mameluke slave; and having, not by the most honourable services, ingratiated himself with the Porte, he rose by degrees to the Pachalic of Acre, which he held for a long period. Of this tyrant we may say, in the brief and emphatic terms in which Tacitus sums up the character of another oppressor who ruled in the same country eighteen hundred years before, though not for so long a period as Djezzar,—

Jus regium servile ingenio exercuit.

'The attendants who waited on him in his tower at Acre, bore on their persons the evident marks of the ferocious and savage disposition of their master, being frightfully disfigured and mutilated. He attended faithfully to the public interest, so far as his narrow views taught him that it coincided with his own. He built large granaries, but neglected the improvement of agriculture. Though his jealousy of his subjects rendered him cautious in going abroad, his cavalry scoured the country, levying the tribute of their master, and commit-

ting any atrocity he was pleased to enjoin. The limits of his extensive pachalic, which included great part of the Holy Land, might be easily known by the air of gloom and desolation with which it was overspread. Sometimes he went out in disguise, attended by an executioner; if he happened to surprise any one in what he accounted a fault, he pronounced sentence on him immediately. The criminal bowed his neck; the executioner struck, and the head fell. This tyrant, who died not many years ago, at nearly the age of eighty, is still remembered in Acre, in the streets of which, some of the miserable beings whom he mutilated may yet be seen. In the rapid exaltation of this oppressor from the base condition of a slave, and in the long list of extortions which he committed, and which fell heavily on the few Jews who dwell at this day in the country, we see the fulfilment of the prophecy, *the stranger that is within thee shall get up above thee very high, and thou shalt come down very low. He shall be the head, and thou shalt be tail.*

'Of late, the government of Palestine has undergone a change, but a change of such a nature as to show that the prophecy is still fulfilling. The Pacha of Egypt, Mehemet Ali, having conceived the project of throwing off the dominion of the Porte, in 1831 transported into Syria a large body of troops, under the command of his son, Ibrahim Pacha. Ibrahim dispersed the forces of the Sultan in several pitched battles; overran Syria; marched to Constantinople, and threatened the very existence of the Porte. A treaty was signed by Kutiah in 1833, whereby the government of the whole of Syria was ceded to the Pacha of Egypt; and the only mark of his dependence on the Sultan was a stipulated yearly payment of thirty-five thousand purses, a sum amounting to one hundred and seventy-five thousand pounds.

'This change has brought no relief to the inhabitants. If their Turkish rulers chastised them with whips, their Egyptian masters have chastised them with scorpions. The old taxes have been nearly doubled, and additional ones have been imposed. A personal tax, called *ferde*, is now levied from every male above the age of fourteen. The tax varies from fifteen to five hundred piastres, according to the supposed circumstances of the individual. It is with the Egyptian *ferde* as with the Turkish *miri*, each district must continue to yield the same amount as when the tax was first imposed; no allowance is made for emigration or death, and thus the *ferde* is often increased exorbitantly on individuals. The extortions of the petty governors have been put an end to by the Egyptian government; but illegal acts are frequently committed by the government itself, more oppressive and impoverishing than the petty tyranny which it put down. The inhabitants are often obliged to sell their wheat, timber, and oil to the pacha below their price. Their horses and mules are often pressed into the service of the army without any adequate return for their use; and common artisans are taken from their families and compelled to labour in the government works at less than half the rate payable for free labour.

'But the severest measure of Egyptian tyranny is the conscription. The Syrian peasant's cup of suffering was already full; this was the

drop which caused it to overflow. The day when the new levy is to be made is kept secret, but a Friday is generally chosen, being the Sabbath of the Moslem. Parties of soldiers having been previously distributed in the various quarters of the city, a gun is fired as a signal. Scarcely has its sound died away when the soldiers rush upon the citizens who are crowding to the mosques. Those whom they are able to enclose are driven away like cattle, and shut up in the great square of the Serai. After being examined by the army physician, if not physically disqualified, they are drafted into the regiments.

It is impossible to describe the grief and consternation which reign over the whole country at the periods of these forced levies. It is seldom that one day suffices to raise the requisite amount of men, and while the conscription is going on, the trade and agriculture of the country are completely suspended. The inhabitants of the towns and villages flee to the mountains, the ploughs are forsaken, and even the mule-driver, leaving his goods on the highway, seeks safety in flight. Between those on whom the conscription happens to fall, and the relatives from whom they are thus suddenly torn away, the most heart-rending scenes ensue. 'Within the enclosure,' says Mr. Farren, 'which files of armed troops surround, the wretched victims are crowded together, bowed down with despair, while, pressing upon every avenue, their wives and daughters and aged mothers may be seen, wildly darting their frenzied glances through the captives in search of a missing relative, or bursting into paroxysms of despair on beholding the lost objects of their fears; and all around the air is rent by the cries of these unfortunates, cursing, as I have heard them, the very name of their prophet, and invoking the Deity himself to avenge the cause of the poor and the oppressed.' Thus the prophecy is still fulfilling on this unhappy land. *I will give it into the hands of strangers for a prey, and to the wicked of the earth for a spoil.*'—pp. 288—296.

This is a sufficiently gloomy picture of the sufferings of the people, and the wretched system of social government under which they groan. Its veracity is attested by every traveller who has ever visited the country. Under such oppressions, and with such calamities always impending over their heads, it is no wonder that the people are strangers to joy, and that the voice of music is rarely heard in the land. Where there is no protection to person and property, there can be no adequate industry, nothing that can approximate to prosperity. Human efforts require their natural stimulus of reward, or the fair hope of it; and without this it languishes.

The interest of the present volume is not confined to the Holy Land. The author has taken commendable pains to present to his readers a tolerably comprehensive view of those contiguous countries whose history is blended in sacred writ with that of Judea; and concerning which distinct prophecies are upon record. The present condition of Ammon, for

instance, supplies many remarkable features which strikingly illustrate the inspiration of those prophecies, in which they were depicted so many centuries ago, and when there was no human probability of their accomplishment. The country of Ammon is next to the territory of Judea, is bounded from north to south by the Jordan, and at about the middle, between Bashan and Gilead on the north, and Moab on the south; while the land of Edom is found still further south, below the lake into which the Jordan flows. The whole of this central territory called Ammon, is beautifully diversified with hill and dale, and retains traces of the most abundant luxuriance. The amazing extent of its population may be inferred from the ruins which abound over its whole surface. The hills and vales and plains everywhere appear to have been crowded with human habitations, and a vast proportion of these display evidences of art and luxury which may well fill the traveller with admiration and astonishment. Civilization must evidently have risen to a high pitch in Syria at a very early period, and long before its first elements had reached the European nations. Mr. Wylie gives an interesting outline of the history of Ammon and its people, from which, as bearing particularly upon the fulfilment of prophecy, we must make some citations.

'Of the wealth and power of the Ammonites in early times, and the great fertility of the country, there can be no doubt. The wars they waged with the Jews, and the heavy imposts they sustained, attest their great national resources. When the country was invaded by the Saracens, at the period we have indicated, Gibbon attests that it was enriched by trade, that it contained strong and populous cities, and was covered with a line of forts. At this day, whatever spot happens to be cultivated yields the richest returns; and though the country generally is a desert, yet here and there occur tracts of surpassing beauty and richness; and what must have been the original fertility of that soil, which so many ages of neglect have not been able to exhaust? The ruins that cover her plains, likewise attest the number of the ancient cities of Ammon. * * * *

'How utterly improbable must the desolation of Ammon have appeared at that period. Conquered she might be; but no one who thought of her fertile soil, opulent cities, and extensive commerce, could have believed it possible that so rich a country should remain for ages in ruin—that for many generations her fields should cease to be cultivated, and her cities to be inhabited. Yet such was the doom which the prophets denounced against her.

'From a comparison of the prophecies relating to Ammon, it is clear that this country was to be visited with a first and second destruction. It was expressly foretold that Ammon should recover from her first overthrow; but after her second desolation she was to be known no more—she was to perish out of the countries. (See Jeremiah, xlix. 2—6; Ezek. xxv. 1—7.)

'About the year of the world 3468, Cyrus, King of Persia, having made himself master of the Chaldean empire, granted permission to the Ammonites to return to their own country. 'Afterwards, I will bring again the captivity of the children of Ammon, saith the Lord.' Their return was a short time posterior to that of the Jews. Planted a second time in their own country, their trade returned, their population increased, and their cities rose into more than their former splendour. Their ancient enmity against the Jews was still retained; and living on their borders, they found frequent opportunities of displaying it. The gospel appears to have been introduced into Ammon in the first ages of Christianity; and the fact is attested at this day by the ruins of churches which are still to be met with in their country. Their prosperity as a country continued till about the year 635 of the Christian era, where they were invaded and overthrown by the Saracens. It was to this last and final overthrow, from which it was foretold the nation of Ammon should never revive, that our attention is now to be turned.

'Son of man, set thy face against the Ammonites, and prophesy against them, and say unto the Ammonites, hear the word of the Lord God. Thus saith the Lord God, because thou saidst, aha! against my sanctuary when it was profaned, and against the land of Israel when it was desolate, and against the house of Judah when it went into captivity; behold, therefore, I will deliver thee to the men of the East for a possession, and they shall set their palaces in thee, and make their dwelling in thee. They shall eat thy fruit, and they shall drink thy milk. And I will make Rabbah a stable for camels, and the Ammonites a couching place for flocks; and ye shall know that I am the Lord. For thus saith the Lord God, because thou hast clapped thine hands, and stamped with the feet, and rejoiced in thy heart with all thy despite against the land of Israel, behold, therefore, I will stretch out mine hand upon thee, and will deliver thee for a spoil to the heathen, and I will cut thee off from the people, and I will cause thee to perish out of the countries. I will destroy thee, and thou shalt know that I am the Lord.' (Ezek. xxv. 1—7.)

'Ammon retained her prosperity till a long period posterior to the giving of this prophecy. Every succeeding year witnessed the extension of her trade, and every succeeding age saw new cities arise to adorn the country. The longer she existed, the infliction of her doom became the more improbable. Prosperity continued to flow upon her, the prediction of the prophet appeared to be forgotten, and Ammon, doubtless, was saying with another city, 'I shall sit a queen for ever.' As she contemplated from her strong frontier, the undisciplined and savage hordes which roamed over the eastern desert, she might bid defiance to the doom with which the prophecy of Ezekiel menaced her. Nevertheless, the hour drew on—the fatal hour which dried up the channels of her trade, brought down her princely cities to the dust, and converted her smiling fields into a silent and dreary waste.

'*I will deliver thee to the men of the East for a possession.* In 632, the country of Ammon, together with all the countries on the East of the Jordan, was invaded by the Saracens, 'the men of the

East.' The inhabitants of Syria were unable to contend with the children of the desert. The valour of the Saracens, inspired by religious enthusiasm, and stimulated by the prospect of enjoying the luxuries of Syria, no feeble temptation when we consider the naked desert from which they had come, rendered their arms irresistible.

* * * * * *

'The fortunes of the country, since the hour it became a possession of *the men of the East*, have been in striking accordance with what the prophet foretold. *I will stretch out mine hand upon thee, and will deliver thee for a* SPOIL *to the heathen.* At present, this fine country is possessed by the Arabs, and governed by the Turks. We have already seen the manner in which the Turks treat the countries which they govern. In the language of Volney, singularly coincident with that of the prophet, they consider them a 'spoil.' Ammon has formed no exception. Everywhere her soil exhibits signs of the greatest fertility; but of what avail are the riches of nature when they are never turned to account by the industry of man. Spring opens upon her plains, but there the sower is never seen. Autumn comes round; but when no seed has been sown, no harvest can be reaped. On her fields we are able to discover only a few Arabs feeding their flocks on the spontaneous produce, and gathering them at night into the ruins of the cities. And to what is this state of matters owing? It is to be attributed entirely to the tyranny of those who have made the country a spoil. All travellers unite in deprecating the Turkish tyranny,—in other words, in bearing their testimony to the truth of the prophecy which foretold that these countries should be a spoil to the heathen. A writer who visited Syria in the end of the seventeenth century speaks of the 'Turks ruling with a lawless sway, and not allowing those they injure to complain.' * * * *

'Thus far have we shown the fulfilment of the prophecy as regards the land of Ammon. She fell by the hands of brutish men, and skilful to destroy. She has been given to the men of the East for a possession; they have set their palaces in her, and made their dwellings in her; they have eaten her fruit, and drunk her milk; and from the hour she was conquered to the present day, she has been a spoil to the heathen.'—pp. 375—385.

The author proceeds to give a sketch of the present aspect of the country. He takes us from Zsalt, which is situated about twenty-two miles from Abon Obeida, in the plain of the Jordan, by Feheis, to many ruined towns, and principally describes the desolation of Rabbah, whose fortifications, temples, triumphal arches, castles, and a splendid amphitheatre, astonish the beholder with the evidences which they supply of the art and wealth of the former inhabitants of these regions.

It is quite impossible to give our readers even a specimen of the author's description of the ruins and monuments, not less interesting, which are strewed over the countries of Moab and Edom. The latter country supplies many of the most sublime

monuments of antiquity, as well as many most remarkable verifications of all that is recorded in the volume of inspiration, concerning the doom of those ancient contemporaries of the Jews. The singular fact must strike every inquiring mind. Ammon, Moab, and Edom, as nations, are extinct. The children of Israel still survive. They await some future destiny. The prophecy is as exactly fulfilled in the extinction of those nations that were the perpetual enemies of Israel, as in the preservation of the seed of Jacob, though scattered among all nations; while the desolate condition of the countries they severally inhabited, and the present improbability of their improvement, exhibit the most perfect agreement, even in the minutest particulars, with the doom that was inscribed against them all in the sacred scroll of prophecy ages before their prosperity had begun to decline.

From the length of the extracts we have given, our readers will rightly conclude that we consider Mr. Wylie's book an exceedingly interesting and instructive one. It contains the marrow of all that has been brought to light relative to these countries. We have no fault to find, save that occasionally there are repetitions of former statements, and a few Scotticisms which offend English ears. We trust the author will have an opportunity of correcting these blemishes, by the demand for another edition. It is one of the best books we know, both for Bible classes to read, and for vestry libraries to contain.

Art VI. *The History of Woman in England, and her influence on Society and Literature from the earliest period.* By Hannah Lawrance. Vol. I. to the year 1200. London: Henry Colburn.

Miss Lawrance is already advantageously known to the public by her *Memoirs of the Queens of England*, a work which, for sound research, enlightened appreciation of historical evidence, and able disquisition, is entitled to a high rank amongst the historical productions of our day. The work now before us, of which the first volume only is yet published, has evidently grown out of the former, and will constitute a most interesting and valuable supplement to it. 'In the course of reading for the former work' we are informed, 'the interest of the writer was awakened by the many valuable notices of female society, which not only the monkish chronicle, but the legal record and the household book supplied; and when she turned over the pages of many a forgotten Anglo-Norman poet, she discovered, with increased interest, that not to queens alone, but to many a high-born lady, our literature owed its chief encouragement. Still, as she proceeded in her pleasant task, she found each contemporary

remain—legend, tale, miracle, play, will, inventory, diary—combined to throw a vivid light, not merely on society during the middle ages, but especially on the condition of woman in England.' The object of the present work is to trace the progress of female society in England, from the earliest period of her history, and thus to illustrate the influence of woman on our civilization and literature.

Great attention has recently been paid by several distinguished writers to the claims and duties of women, yet no attempt has been made to exhibit an historical view of their mental and social condition, or to define the influences they have exerted on the progress of society, or on the formation of those habits and that state of feeling on which so much of its well-being depends. This is an important omission, which we are glad to have supplied by so competent a writer as Miss Lawrance. The department she has chosen is one for the occupation of which she is eminently fitted. Intimately acquainted with the earlier records of our history, she possesses also a sound judgment, a discriminating taste, and an intuitive perception of the proprieties of different ages, which are rarely found in combination. Various theories have recently been propounded on the character of the female mind, some writers having maintained, with a gallantry more suited to a former than to the present age, its equality, if not its superiority, to that of the other sex. For ourselves, we are little interested in such a question. Each intellect has its own distinctive characteristics, and a scope for its activity to which the other is wholly unsuited. We refer to the subject only to remark, which we do with pleasure, that Miss Lawrance avows no theory on this point; she expresses no opinion respecting it; she does not even note that such a question has been raised, but prosecutes her legitimate inquiry with a singleness of purpose which promises well for the result.

The present volume commences with the invasion of the Romans, and brings down the history to the early part of the thirteenth century. The masculine courage and tragical fate of Boadicea, one of the early British queens, are familiar to most of our readers; but her atrocious wrongs endured at the hands of the Romans are not so commonly known. The following account of this remarkable woman will be read with interest:—

'The next female name is one well known to the general reader, and deservedly so, as of one who bravely, though unavailingly, fought for freedom—Boadicea, or probably more correctly, Bonduca. The fate of this unfortunate queen was what has unhappily been too common in the history of colonization, although few treated with equal cruelty have inflicted as severe a revenge. Boadicea was the widow of a king of the Iceni, a powerful race, inhabiting the eastern part of Britain,

and her husband at his death bequeathed to her his throne and half his treasures, at the same time constituting the Roman emperor—probably to secure his aid against the neighbouring tribes—joint-heir with his two daughters of the remaining half portion. The imperial procurator, however, seized the whole treasure; and when the widow remonstrated, he caused her to be scourged, and her daughters to be seized and treated as slaves.

'The cruelly injured queen loudly proclaimed her wrongs; she collected multitudes together, to whom she detailed her sufferings; she pointed out the oppressive tyranny to which they were subjected, the heavy taxations imposed on those who had submitted to the Roman yoke, and concluded by denouncing that rapacity which, not content with spoiling the living, 'had taxed even the dead.'

'Her burning words excited the fiercest emotions in the listening multitude that surrounded her; she then took a hare which she had concealed in her vest, and let it slip, that by its course the attendant Druids, among whom the hare was viewed as a sacred animal, might foretell the result of the enterprise. The turnings and windings of the affrighted animal were pronounced of favourable omen—the Druids promised victory; the multitudes shouted aloud, and Boadicea prepared to lead by her valour those whom her resistless eloquence had gathered around her.

'The march of the immense but undisciplined army was southward. They soon reached the flourishing city of Camulodunum (Malden), and reduced it to ashes. They next held on, unopposed, toward London, even at this period a wealthy and populous city, but inhabited chiefly by Roman colonists. London shared the same fate as Camulodunum; for a superstitious terror seems to have paralysed the Romans, and Boadicea and her army passed onward to Verulam, the municipal city; and ere the legions of Suetonius could arrive, its splendid buildings lay a smoking ruin, and the barbarian army was loaded with its spoils. At length the Roman forces combined near London, and offered battle. The site of this desperate but decisive conflict has been variously stated, but the rising ground to the north of London, where, until very lately, the traces of a large Roman encampment were clearly to be seen, was most probably the spot.

'Here, at length, the well-disciplined legions of Rome and the barbarian army met, and again Boadicea addressed her people, conjuring them to fight bravely. She reminded them of their late successes, urged them to make one other effort to achieve their freedom, and then, as though prophetic of the result, added, that although the men might choose to live and be slaves, she, a woman, was determined to conquer or to die. The Britons again advanced with shouts; but the Roman legions received the shock firmly, and then, forming a wedge, broke through the large but unconnected human mass, and fearfully avenged the slaughter of their countrymen. Seventy thousand Romans are said to have been put to death by the Britons in the preceding conflicts;—eighty thousand Britons now fell in this fatal battle. Boadicea, 'disdaining to survive the liberties of her land,' drank

poison; nor can the historian deny his meed of admiration to the unfortunate queen, who fought and fell with Roman courage.'—pp. 6—10.

Of the Saxon women generally it is difficult to obtain any very definite account. The historian is compelled to draw out his conclusion from an extensive collection of minute particulars, between some of which it is difficult to establish a perfect congruity. Those who occupied the higher stations of society do not appear to have been in a condition much inferior to that of the Anglo-Normans. Their clothes and jewels, such, at least, as were possessed prior to marriage, were disposable at their own pleasure, and the number and value of these possessions were by no means inconsiderable. The social habits of our Saxon ancestors coincided with the respect shown by their laws. Their women were not excluded from their feasts or their amusements, but presided at the grandest entertainments given by their lords. The little that can be gleaned respecting the other classes of Saxon women is presented by our author in the following passage:—

'Of the middle and lower orders of Saxon women we can learn but few particulars. Although an hereditary aristocracy did not exist among the Saxons, they recognised various ranks; and prohibited by custom, if not by express law, intermarriage of the higher with the inferior. Four classes were recognised among them; the etheling or noble, the free or landholders, the freedmen (these probably answered to our working classes) and the bondsmen, consisting of those who had been taken captive in war, or who had incurred the loss of freedom as a punishment for crime.

'Of the females belonging to the second and third classes, our notices are very few. Probably they consisted of but few individuals compared with the servile class; and as, although it is likely they lived in comparative comfort, they had few gifts to bequeath to the neighbouring monastery, the record of their unobtrusive but useful lives has wholly passed away. The easy labour of the distaff, and the more difficult employment of the loom, doubtless formed their chief occupation; and not improbably, in some instances, might aid in providing for the family: but at this early period there was scarcely a market for home produce, since the nobles among their extensive households numbered every species of workman and workwoman, from the smith and the carpenter, the weaving and sewing maiden, to the woodcutter and the grinding slave who toiled at her rude handmill to grind corn for the family.

'But although we seek in vain for those pictures of domestic life, or those minute traits that might bring female society in Saxon times vividly before us, from the unexceptional testimony of the laws we find that each class of women not only enjoyed legal protection, but that the protection afforded to females was insured by a *double* fine. The principle of pecuniary compensation for injury is the leading

feature of Saxon jurisprudence. Each individual had the protection of the *were* and the privilege of the *mund*. The first of these, the *were*, was the legal valuation of the person, varying according to his situation in life; 'If he was killed, it was the penalty his murderer had to pay for his crime; if he committed crimes, it was the penalty which, in many cases, he had to discharge.' The *mund*, or *mundbyrd*, was the right of protection—of civil protection—'the principle of the doctrine that every man's house is his castle;' and this, like the *were*, varied according to the class to which each belonged. Thus, on reference to the oldest code of Saxon laws extant, that of Ethelbert, king of Kent, we find the king's *mundbyrd* guarded by a penalty of fifty shillings, while that of an earl's was estimated at twenty. But superior protection was granted to women, and thus the *mundbyrd* of the earl's widow was the same as that assigned for the king himself, and that for the woman of the second class was the same as for the earl. For the woman belonging to the third class, the *mund* was *twelve* shillings, the sum assigned for the man of the second class; while for the bondswoman the *mund* was six, the same price as that of the ceorl. If a widow was carried away from her dwelling against her consent, the compensation was to be double her *mund;* and forcible marriages were prohibited under the severest penalties, ecclesiastical no less than civil. From the laws of King Ina, we learn that a ceorl's widow was allowed the guardianship of her child until it was of age, the kindred taking care of the paternal possession, and allowing her a fixed sum for its maintenance. In the laws of King Canute a curious passage occurs, which proves that the wife, even among the lower classes, was considered as having an exclusive right to her domestic stores. 'If any man bring a stolen thing home to his cot, and he be detected, it is just that the owner should have what he went after. And unless it has been brought under his wife's *key-lockers*, let her be clear; for it is her *duty* to keep the key of them,—namely, her store-room, her chest, and her cupboard. If it be brought under any of these, then she is guilty; but no wife may forbid her husband that he may not put into his cot what he will.'

'Of the condition of the largest class of females, the bondswomen, we can obtain very little information; but while the situation of the bondsmen appears to have been most degraded, there is great reason to believe that that of the female slaves was comparatively comfortable. In a rude age, when laws are weak, and society unsettled, and even a subsistence often most difficult to obtain, the 'theow,' under the protection of a kind master, actually remained more secure, and certainly more assured of a provision than the small holder of land or the free servant. Now the female theow was not only secure of these, but, from the very offices she was called to fill, could scarcely fail to become an object of kindness, probably even of affection, to her mistress.'—pp. 50—54.

The genius of Alfred, the greatest of Saxon monarchs, was elicited by the cultivation of his step-mother Judith, the daughter

of a foreign race, and descended to Ethelfleda, his eldest daughter, of whom Miss Lawrance furnishes the following brief history:—

'His eldest daughter, Ethelfleda, is described by all the contemporary historians as possessing a greater share of his talents and energies than any of his other children. She was married early in life to Ethered, ealderman of Mercia, and appears to have distinguished herself during her father's lifetime by the wisdom of her counsels. On the accession of her Edward the elder, we are told that she became his chief adviser; and on the death of her husband Ethered, in 912, Edward appointed her 'lady of the Mercians,' a name by which she is more frequently designated than by that of Ethelfleda. Her government of this important portion of the land was judicious and vigorous. The same year that she was appointed she built the fortresses of Shergate and Bridgenorth, and in the following year the Saxon Chronicle relates that she went with all the Mercians to Tamworth, and built the fort there; also one at Stafford, and in the autumn one at Warwick. Three years after, according to the same venerable authority, 'the innocent abbot Egbert, having been slain by the Welsh, she within three nights sent an army into Wales, and stormed Brecknock, and took the king's wife and other noble women.'

'Within two years after, 'the lady of the Mercians' added the town of Derby to Mercia, and, in 920, 'took the town of Leicester without loss, and the greater part of the army submitted to her. The people of York also promised, and confirmed it, that they would be of her interest, and had begun to take the oaths,' thus taking the first steps toward the incorporation of the kingdom of Northumbria with Mercia; but, 'twelve nights before midsummer, in the eighth year of her holding the government of the Mercians with right dominion, she departed, and her body lieth at Gloucester in the east porch of St. Peter's church.' The loss of so active a coadjutrix was bitterly lamented by Edward, who, though a wise and active king, does not seem to have possessed those military talents which were so pre-eminent in his sister. It is, however, very probable that 'the lady of the Mercians' possessed, like her father, more valuable qualities than mere warlike skill. She is represented by Malmsbury and Higden as an active restorer of those towns within her dominions that had been destroyed during the Danish invasions; and so warmly did popular feeling dwell upon the deeds of the wise and valiant Ethelfleda, that in the curious old chronicle of England, which details in rude numbers the doings of our kings, from the apocryphal days of Brute, down to those of Edward the First, the minstrel turns aside from the celebration of Edward the elder to sing the praises of 'the lady of the Mercians.'—pp. 134—136.

The battle of Hastings effected a momentous change in the social habits, as well as the political institutes of the kingdom. While its immediate consequences were disastrous, humiliating to the national spirit, and fraught with a thousand forms of suf-

fering to the high born and noble, its more remote effects were friendly to the advancement of the people, and the development of those capabilities which were latent in the national mind. It introduced new and softening elements into its character, and laid the basis for those more civilized and permanent forms which our Society has subsequently borne.

The Saxon nobility were, no doubt, in many cases wrongfully dispossessed of their estates, which were divided amongst the military retainers of the Conqueror: but great benefits followed the establishment of Norman rule. The contemporaries of William saw only the evils which flowed from his victory. They felt the iron sway of the Norman as a national degradation, and mourned over the change of property and rule which was consequent thereon. This was perfectly natural in their circumstances, and we may well excuse the bitterness of their invectives. Our own position, however, is far more favourable to an accurate estimate of the change. Centuries have elapsed since the death of Harold transferred the government of England to the Norman line, and it would be the height of folly to question the immense advantages which have resulted from it. The qualities of that chivalric race softened and meliorated the rude character of our Saxon ancestors, and ultimately formed, in conjunction with it, a national mind in which the love of liberty is indigenous, and on which is still reposed the best hopes of our world. 'Norman luxury and refinement awakened Saxon improvement; Norman scholarship aroused Saxon intellect; and Norman prowess stimulated Saxon valour.' The Saxon chroniclers were accustomed to portray in the darkest colourings the licentious and tyrannical outrages perpetrated by the Normans, but in this there was much exaggeration, as Miss Lawrance and other writers have shown.

'The fact that on the invasion of William many women fled to the convents and sought the protection of the veil as a guard against the insults of the Norman soldiery, has been often brought forward as a proof of the grievous oppressions under which the Saxon community laboured. But the equally well authenticated fact that a very short time after—a time when, according to the self-same writers, tyranny and injustice on the part of the invaders were at their height, these recluses supplicated leave to quit their convents and mingle again in the cares and pleasures of secular life, proves that the fears they had entertained were groundless, and that the Norman yielded that respect to Saxon women which, neither from the Danish invaders nor from the more powerful among their own countrymen, they had heretofore received.

'Very little can be ascertained in regard to the situation of the lowest class of women at this period. These were the bondswomen;

and that many availed themselves of the advantages proffered by the walled towns, where uninterrupted residence for a year and a day ensured them freedom, cannot be doubted; while that those who remained were not in a worse condition than when under Saxon rule, may be easily believed from the attention which the Conqueror paid to this class, directing the services of the serfs on each manor to be defined, that in future time more might not be demanded. Of that class of bondswomen whose services were domestic, we may also well believe that their condition was even improved, by falling into the hands of a Norman mistress.

'In all peculiarly female work the Saxons, from the highest orders to the lowest, were eminently skilful, while the Norman women never seem to have practised any of those occupations which were the pride of the rival race. Thus the weaving maiden, and the maiden skilled in needle-work, though only on rude canvass, and coarse as the Bayeux tapestry, must have become objects of importance to the Norman female, who, for the first time in her life, on William's triumphant return to Rouen, had beheld the splendidly broidered garments of the Saxon nobles, which, as William of Poictou informs us, excited equal admiration with the beauty of the plate and jewellery, and the loveliness of the Saxon youth who wore them.'—pp. 198—201.

Miss Lawrance has directed considerable attention to the monastic institutions of the Saxon and Anglo-Norman ages, and has brought together a mass of information which cannot fail to be deeply interesting. Those of the former period were distinguished by a peculiarity which has greatly perplexed many writers. The choice of the prior was with the lady abbess, by whose instructions he was bound to regulate his conduct. Miss Lawrance accounts for this departure from the usual ecclesiastical rule, by the fact, that nearly all the early monasteries were founded by women of royal birth, and that, as the conventual rule was but a domestic rule on a larger scale, the high-born Saxon women were deemed more fitted for it than 'the men who, though equally high-born, had been trained up to consider war and the chase as their sole occupations.' At a later period, schools were connected with the conventual houses, which, as exercising extensive influence over the character and social condition of the women of the middle ages, receive at the hands of our author particular notice. The nuns of this period were not so completely shut out from general society as their more modern descendants. Miss Lawrance informs us:—

'They were allowed to receive visitors in the presence of another nun; and on some occasions, 'secular women' seem to have been allowed to sojourn for some time in the house. From the injunctions of the dean of St. Paul's, before referred to, we find that, in respect to this convent, St. Helen's, Bishopsgate, the nuns were accustomed to have visitors, and to entertain them with dancing and other recrea-

tions; this, however, was severely condemned. Nor was the nun strictly confined within the walls of her convent; she was permitted to visit her parents, or her near relations, for recreation, or to attend them when sick, or to follow them to the grave. She was also allowed to quit the house if sick, for change of air, or 'to make cures'—an incidental remark, which proves how highly prized was the medical skill of the nun. Permission for those purposes was given her in the chapter, but if she required a longer time of absence, the bishop or superintendant of the convent was to be applied to, and he could give licence for an indefinite period; but, on her journey, she was always to be accompanied by suitable attendants, and the abbess or prioress was escorted by her chaplain and attendant nuns.'—pp. 277—280.

Of the schools connected with these establishments, it is difficult to form any very precise notion. Miss Lawrance, we suspect, rates them somewhat too highly, but their existence at such a period, and amidst elements so uncongenial, is in itself a deeply interesting fact which deserves the grave consideration and study of the historical student. Her account of them is as follows:—

'All the convents that followed the Benedictine rule were bound to have a school; and to this part of their duty the nuns gave willing obedience. These convent schools were the great fountains from whence education was supplied to the female part of the population during the middle ages; and the notices which we can gather respecting the illustrious women of that period, prove that the convent school well fulfilled its purpose.

'That the school was viewed as a necessary adjunct to the female convent early in this century, is proved from the remarks of Ailfred of Rievesby, who wrote near its close, in which he evidently considers the task of instruction as one of the most usual occupations of the nun; and although he seems to object to her thus employing her time, yet his remarks rather refer to the want of discipline, and probably the extreme youth of the children, than to convent instruction in general.

'There are some nuns,' says he, 'who turn their cell into a school. She sits at the window, the child stands in the cloister; she looks earnestly at each of them, and while watching their play, now she is angry, now she laughs, now she threatens, now soothes, now spares, now kisses; now calls the weeping child to be beaten, and then strokes her face, and catching her round the neck eagerly caresses her, calling her 'her little daughter and darling.' This species of 'infant-school,' the worthy writer probably considered beneath the dignity of the convent, but we may thank his graphic description for preserving to us so pleasing a picture of the nun of the middle ages.

'Convents were, however, even to a late period, the abode of young children. The two young half-brothers of Henry VI., Edmund and Jaspar Tudor, were consigned to the care of the abbess of Barking; and the children of benefactors to these establishments were often, on the death of one or both their parents, placed beneath the protection of the lady abbess or prioress.

'The regulations under which female scholars were admitted, have not been handed down to us; it is questionable too, whether these schools were not in large towns *day*-schools. And while the higher classes received an education suitable to their rank, it appears that the middle classes were not neglected; a very old man having told Aubrey, that just previously to the dissolution of the monasteries, he had, when a boy, been accustomed to see the nuns of St. Mary, near Bridgewater, go out into one of the meadows belonging to the house, surrounded by their scholars, each with a distaff in hand.

'It is probable, that as Lanfranc's rule directed all education to be gratuitous, the instruction provided in female convents was gratuitous also. It however, appears, toward the later period, that money was paid for boarders; and we find, from Dean Kentwode's injunctions to the nuns of St. Helen's, that some of them received *private* pupils; for he expressly says, 'Also, we ordeyn that noon nun have, or receive noo chyldren wyth them into ye house forsayde, but yf (except that) ye profit turne to ye vayle of ye same house.'

'The nuns who did so, were most likely those who were highly distinguished in the various branches of convent education, and from whom, therefore, the parents of the scholars were anxious to obtain the advantages of a more exclusive attention than the general scholars received.

'The regular convent school was most probably under the superintendence of the præcentrix, an officer whose duties, as we have seen, were of a more *literary* character than those of her sisters. As the keeper of the library, she must have been what is termed one of the 'learned nuns,' and from her the scholars probably received instruction in 'grammar,' which, in the phraseology of the middle ages, signified a knowledge of Latin. To her, doubtless, was also assigned the task of teaching music,—a science from the very earliest period assidiously cultivated in female convents; for the exquisite sweetness of the nuns' singing has been dwelt upon by many a middle-age writer.

'With her, as is the case in modern female convents, the nuns whose education and whose tastes fitted them for the office of teachers, seem to have been associated; and those who, scarcely capable of imparting instruction in the more literary branches, were distinguished for their skill in the subordinate departments of education, taught, under her superintendence, those various works of skill or usefulness which, no less than 'grammar' and music, formed the routine of the convent school.

'Among these works of skill, the foremost place must be assigned to that art in which the English woman, especially the inmate of the convent, stood pre-eminent among every European nation,—the art of embroidery.'—pp. 291—296.

The present volume, as already intimated, brings down the history to the close of the twelfth century, furnishing, as our author remarks, 'a dim and shadowy sketch, in which, although we may catch a faint gleam of the 'cloth of gold,' 'cloth of

frieze,' is scarcely discernible.' From this period a clearer light is shed on the progress of society in England, and we anticipate no small pleasure in accompanying Miss Lawrance through the more luminous and picturesque era which follows. Her labours cannot fail to be highly appreciated, more especially by her own sex, to whom, as indeed to all our readers, we strongly recommend the volume. It combines in an eminent degree, sound sense and solid information, with the more attractive qualities of female authorship.

Art. VII. 1. *Geology for Beginners.* By G. F. Richardson, F.G.S. 12mo. 1842. London: H. Bailliere, 219, Regent-street.

2. *Models of Teeth and Bones of the Ignanodon Hylæosaurus and Gavial.* J. Tennant, 149, Strand.

3. *Sopwith's Geological Models, with Description.* J. Tennant, Strand.

In reading, as we have with much pleasure read, Mr. Richardson's Geology for beginners, we could not avoid recurring to our early experience in this study, with a feeling of regret that we had not the facilities which this interesting volume is fitted to impart to the class for whom it is designed. Compared with the tortuous path we traced, and the many *detours* we made, a *cul de sac* being sometimes the reward of many a weary day's wanderings, the path along which we have passed during the last few days in Mr. Richardson's agreeable company has been indeed a royal road. We advert to our own early experience only because we know it is that of many others, and because we are convinced that there is a large class participating in the general interest now felt in the 'wonders of geology,' who really 'wonder' whether the supposed difficulties of 'geology' can ever be overcome. There is no lack, indeed, of guides, whose assistance is readily proffered to the inquirer, and whose pens scribble freely enough on this and every subject on which the public are known to feel an interest; but we regard it as highly important that first steps should be taken under the direction of those who have traversed again and again the country through which the traveller wishes to pass, and who are well qualified to indicate the *route* he should take. The successful teacher of geology, as well as of every other science, should be familiar with the end at which the pupil ought to arrive, in order that he might save him from all useless expenditure of study, just as the ploughman should eye the point he would gain if he would cut a straight furrow in the field.

It too frequently happens that those who have made any proficiency in science, render but little help to 'beginners.' In some instances the successful student feels encouraged, by the attainments he has made, to undertake the mastery of difficulties which still remain to be conquered, so that he has not the leisure, perhaps, certainly not the inclination, to guide the first doubtful steps of the pilgrim; in others, the difficulty of teaching is felt to be greater by far than the difficulty of learning, and a large amount of knowledge has been accumulated, while the art of communicating it to others has yet to be acquired; while, sometimes it must be confessed that selfishness and pride stand like two gruff porters at the temple of science, not to welcome but repel the inquirer for admission. Be the cause what it may, the fact 'stands confest,' that much has yet to be done on behalf of those who are thirsting for knowledge, and by those who having reached the fountains of intelligence, are best fitted to guide its streams into channels where they are most wanted, and will be most welcome.

In Mr. Richardson, the beginner will meet with a guide to his geological studies who has himself (and we suspect not very long since) battled with the many difficulties which come in the way of the inquirer, and having conquered them all, consecrates his attainments to the benevolent work of facilitating the progress of others. The ladder on which he has ascended to his present position he leaves behind him, and waiting at its summit he encourages and guides the footsteps of all who are willing to follow him. As the curator of the Mantellian collection, he enjoyed many advantages of which he has diligently availed himself, and as the result has succeeded in giving to the volume before us the same interesting and popular style that pervades 'the Wonders of Geology,' of which he was the editor; rendering it, however, as he proposed, 'more introductory than the excellent introduction of Mr. Bakewell—more elementary than the admirable elements of Mr. Lyell.'

In pursuance of his design, our author devotes a large part of his book, nearly one half, to the discussion of various topics with which the student must be acquainted before he is prepared to make any progress in understanding the more elaborate works which constitute the literature of geology, or in traversing for himself the various fields which the science lays open before him.

We must confess that we are not prepared to agree with the definition of geology which represents it as 'the inquiry into universal nature, extending throughout all her kingdoms, animal, vegetable, and mineral; and comprising, in its investigations, all time, past, present, and to come;' while at the same time we are

not displeased at the enthusiasm which leads the author of this definition to see so much in his favourite theme.

'Beginners' will not expect to derive from a single volume the means of perfection in any one department of geological study, much less will they suppose that Mr. Richardson can render them perfect geologists; all that he aims at is to indicate the numerous subjects which should engage the student, and to show the means by which adequate information is to be obtained. In pursuing his design, the author directs the attention of the learner to mineralogy, physical geology, fossil conchology, fossil botany, and palæontology, detailing the phenomena of these subjects with sufficient amplitude to meet his inquiries. 'Guides,' and 'elements,' and 'introduction,' generally take it for granted that the learner has already made some proficiency in those sciences which ought to be brought to the study of geology. Our author, on the other hand, proposes to meet the case of those who have not made these attainments, and he therefore gives in one book the information which must generally be sought for in half a dozen. Thus, as mineralogy is indispensably necessary in the study of rocks, a chapter is devoted to that subject, and contains a sketch of its history, the laws of crystallization, the various crystalline forms, and an investigation of the external characters of minerals. To prepare the student for entering on fossil conchology, minute directions are given as to the mode of conducting the study, the various parts of multivalve, bivalve, and univalve shells are described by wood cuts and written description, the names and etymologies of some of the most familiar genera are given, and the cabinets to which the inhabitant of, or visitor in, London may have access, are named. As a specimen of the author's manner, and of his care to point to sources of information, we give an extract from this chapter.

'Shells are the hard bodies which are secreted for the purpose of cover and protection by the soft, inarticulate animals, which inhabit them, called the mollusca. The creature, shortly after it is formed in the egg, begins to construct its shell, and when hatched it deposits on the edge of the mouth of the little shell, which covered its body in the egg, a small portion of mucous secretion. This mucous deposit next dries up, and as soon as it is dry, the animal lines it with a fresh layer composed of other mucous matter, intermixed with other calcareous particles as before. This alternate deposition of mucus, and of mucus mixed with calcareous matter, proceeds as the creature enlarges, and requires more ample cover and protection, and in this manner literally 'grows with its growth, and strengthens with its strength.' The shell is, in fact, moulded on the body of the animal, as the body itself increases in size, forming a cover or a dwelling, a coat of mail, a shed, a boat, a ship, or a palace of pearl, adapted to the exigencies and fitted to the

shape of the wearer. The inequalities or irregularities of the body itself are also reproduced on the shell, and the elevations, depressions, striæ, tubercules, and spines, which distinguish individual objects, may be attributed to corresponding projections or tentacula, or other irregularities in the fleshy form of the constructing agent. Thus, as an eloquent writer has observed, we find that different species of shell-fish are enclosed in various kinds of testaceous coverings. Those which defend the active family of Donax enable them to dart away from the approach of danger; while the shells of their less active relatives, the perambulating Solens, or razor-sheaths, are admirably adapted to assist their movements through the yielding sand. The chitons walk abroad in coats of mail, closely fitted to their shapes, and surrounded with narrow belts or margins covered with scales. The shields of the pholades bristle with points, resembling a file, by means of which they are defended from external injury, when occupied in slowly excavating the most solid rocks; and the hospitable mansion of the peaceful pinna is large enough for the reception, together with himself, of his friend and guest, the hermit crab. The conically shaped patilla, or limpit, remind the observer of dwellers in solitary tents; the helices, or snails, slowly perambulate the garden walks, in coverings which remind us of those of a broad-wheeled wagon; the cardia, or cockles, are provided with thick coverings, which enable them to endure the rough beating of a boisterous sea, while the shells of such species as are fragile, transparent, and scarcely able to resist the slightest pressure, are found in still ponds and muddy ditches. . . .

'The student is referred to cases 3 and 4 of the fifth room in the North Zoological Gallery, in the British Museum, in which are provisionally placed a suit of shells intended to exhibit the more prominent points in the economy of the mollusca. Among the interesting and instructive facts thus displayed are, the mode of growth, the changes which take place in the shell during the increase and expansion of its inhabitant; the manner in which these creatures repair any accident to their shells, or remove, by absorption, any portion which has become unnecessary or inconvenient: these cabinets further present illustrations of the graduation of the straight, or nearly straight, tubular shells into those of a spiral character, as well as specimens of monstrosities and deformed shells; with examples of the mode in which the animals cover, with a shelly coat, any extraneous body attached to the shell; and they further contain an instructive series of moulds and casts.'—pp. 207—209.

The chapter on fossil botany epitomises in a very instructive manner the works of Lindley, Hutton, Buckland, Sternberg, and others who have laboured in those ancient fields from which our fossil flora are obtained. In a very small compass it conveys a great amount of information, which will assist the learner to make a general arrangement of any coal plants he may be able to collect. According to the arrangement of M. Adolphe Brogniart, the whole vegetable realm is divided into six grand classes,

five of them being illustrated by some of the more interesting specimens, of which many very beautiful wood engravings are given.

The subject of fossil animal remains (palæontology) is introduced by a table containing Cuvier's arrangement of the animal kingdom, to which the learner must constantly refer until he has committed it to memory. From the descriptions given of various fossil animals, we select the account of the missourium, or tetracaulodon, as many of our readers have probably seen the majestic specimen itself in the Egyptian Hall, Piccadilly. The description is an abstract of Professor Owen's valuable paper read to the Geological Society.

'Professor Owen, after observing that the specimen was one of the finest ever discovered, and worthy the place of honour in any museum, proceeded to describe its structure, and to ascertain its real position in the animal kingdom. He remarked that the bones, from want of a correct knowledge of its osteology, were placed in an unnatural state of collocation, from which circumstance both its height and length were greatly exaggerated, and he stated its correct dimensions to be about ten feet in height, and about sixteen in length. The two tusks of the upper jaw, which are placed extending in a horizontal direction, he described as occupying an undue position, and observed that they ought unquestionably to be curved upwards; the fact that one of them was found occupying the horizontal posture being of no importance, since the mode of insertion is such as to allow the tusk to rotate in any direction. Addressing his attention next to the generic appellation, *tetracaulodon*, he denied the existence of such a genus as that established by an American *savant*, Dr. Godman, and described the facts to be as follows:—The young mastodon, he stated, possessed four tusks, two in the upper, and two in the lower jaw. The two in the upper jaw remained through life, while the two in the lower jaw, in the female, both decayed and fell out as the animal grew up, the sockets becoming obliterated altogether; in the male, the left one only perished, and the right remained—a circumstance, he added, which ought to have suggested the name tricaulodon, rather than tetracaulodon, as better descriptive of the supposed new genus. In conclusion, from its osteological structure and general characters he had no hesitation in declaring it to be no new animal, but a very fine specimen of a species of mastodon already known, and described and figured by Cuvier as the *mastodon giganteum*.'—p. 308.

Some of our readers perhaps may not have met with the interesting fact mentioned by Mr. Richardson in describing the habits of the *teredina*, which is one of the many proofs of the great advantage the arts may derive from the contemplation of 'art in nature.'

'As the animal of this shell secretes and deposits in the wood a shield or tube for its protection, Sir I. Brunel is stated to have adopted

the idea of perforating the bed of the Thames by defending his progress with a shield from the example thus taught him by the operations of this apparently unimportant and insignificant worm.'—p. 340.

One of the most remarkable subjects for the study of the beginner in geology is furnished by the new red sandstone formation, which contains the footsteps of extinct species (not to say genera) of animals, most clearly and beautifully defined. To these impressions, and to the very few remains that have been discovered of the animals by whom they have been made, Professor Owen has (we are happy to say) directed his attention, and the result of his investigation we give in Mr. Richardson's words:—

'Having directed his attention to these footsteps, and to the remains of the reptiles, consisting of bones and teeth, which had been observed in beds of this character, both in Germany and England, he arrived at the conclusion which, with the highest degree of probability, referred the impressions in question to an animal of a totally different class, (i.e., from the *marsupials;*) he ascertained, on a microscopic investigation of the teeth, that the genera phytosaurus and mastidonsaurus, established by Dr. Jager, on teeth of like character with these, are in fact one. . . . . The fossil teeth, both from England and Germany, exhibited externally the usual reptile form and character, but internally they presented a more complicated texture, approaching that of the ichthyosaurus, yet differing from that and all the other reptiles hitherto discovered, whether recent or extinct. As the texture of these teeth, under the microscope, presents a series of irregular folds, resembling the labyrinthic windings of the human brain, Professor Owen proposes the name of *labyrinthodon* for the genus.'

After giving a wood-cut containing a very beautiful 'section of the tooth of the labyrinthodon,' we are told,—

The professor farther ascertained from the examination of various bones procured from the same formation, that he could determine three species of *labyrinthodon*, and that in this genus the hind extremities were much larger than the fore. Hence the idea was first suggested, that the tracks in question were those of the newly found gigantic frog. It was further observed, that the footmarks of the cheirotherium were more like those of toads than of any other living animal; and lastly, that the size of the three species of labyrinthodon corresponded with that of the three different kinds of footsteps which had already been supposed to belong to three distinct individuals of *cheirotherium*. Finally, the structure of the nasal cavity showed the *labyrinthodon* to be an air-breathing reptile, since the posterior outlets were at the back part of the mouth, instead of being directly under the anterior or external nostrils. It must have expired free air like the saurians, and may in all probability have imprinted on the shore those footsteps which, as before mentioned, were conceived to have been impressed

by an animal walking on dry land. He had long believed that the footprints were those of a batrachian, and most probably of that family which includes the toad and the frog, on account of the difference of size in the fore and hind extremities; but that in consequence of the peculiarities of the impressions, he had always considered that the animal must have been quite distinct, in the form of its feet, from any known batrachian or other reptile; and thus in the labyrinthodon, he observes, we have a batrachian reptile, differing as remarkably from all known batrachia, and from every other reptile, in the form of its teeth.'

Geology is a highly practical science, and will amply repay the attention it may receive from the cultivators of the fine and useful arts, an illustration of which is furnished by the recent investigations made, with a view of discovering the most suitable material for the Houses of Parliament now being erected. A passing notice of this subject is given under the head of 'MAGNESIAN LIMESTONE, OR ZECHSTEIN.'

'This substance has lately been brought into use and repute for architectural purposes, buildings constructed of it having been ascertained to be extremely durable, and to have resisted for ages the attacks of time and the weather. The stone is found, in fact, to combine the varied qualities so much desired by the architect, but so seldom found in the same material, uniting the softness and facility of working of the oolite above, with the hardness and compact texture of the more crystalline rocks below, while the magnesia which it contains is so unfavourable to vegetable growth as to check that miniate vegetation which frequently disfigures the building stones in general use. Qualities thus valuable induced the members of the commission for selecting stone for the new Houses of Parliament, to give the preference to this material over all others which they had the opportunity of inspecting. It was remarkable that in this stone the carbonates of lime and of magnesia exist in nearly equal proportions.'—p. 441.

Throughout his book, Mr. Richardson has carefully studied the improvement of his readers; and in addition to the information he has himself given, has carefully indicated the sources from which further treasures may be derived. The heading of one of the chapters will serve as a specimen of the manner in which these sources of information are pointed out. Let us take for example—

'THE CHALK FORMATION.—Chalk, craie of French; kreide of German authors; chalk-marl, English; craie-tufau, French; kreidemergel, German; green sand, English; glauconie-crayeuse-sableuse, French; chloritische kreide, gruner sund, German.

'MUSEUMS.—Geological Society, collection of Dr. Mantell in the British Museum; that of Mr. Bowerbank, Mr. Saull, Mr. Dixon, of

Worthing, Mr. Purdue, and many private collections in the Southern and Eastern counties, Yorkshire, &c. &c.

'AUTHORS.—Mantell, Lyell, Phillips, Woodward, &c.

'CHARACTERISTICS.—First of the secondary formations; marine; the bed of an ancient sea, containing the usual marine fossils, weeds, plants, corals, shells, fish, and reptiles.'

It would greatly facilitate the study of geology if some arrangement were made for the delivery of lectures at the British Museum, as was recommended by all the scientific persons examined before the Committee of Inquiry of the House of Commons in 1836. We deem it to be most advisable that this great national collection should be employed to the greatest possible extent consistent with the careful preservation of the specimens. It is to be hoped that we shall not long be behind our neighbours in France, where, as we are reminded, 'they manage things better,' and where, as at the *Jardin des Plantes*, the benefit of very excellent lectures is enjoyed by the public.

'*The models of fossils*,' prepared by Mr. Tennant, furnish the student, or the lecturer, with very perfect representations of some highly important and characteristic remains, the originals in most cases being among the most valuable things in the British Museum. The very low price of these 'models,' and the faithful accuracy with which they represent their originals, must ensure for them a very wide circulation. They would form very valuable additions to museums in the country, where they would assist more effectually than any other means to convey just ideas of the magnitude of the vast creatures whose remains they exactly represent. If the oft-quoted adage of *ex unô disce omnes* be strictly applicable to any object, that object is a petrified tooth, or bone of some fossil animal, as Cuvier has shown us, and as the science, of which he may be regarded as the parent, every day shows us. For this reason it is that preparations of 'the claw bone of the gavial,' 'the tooth of the Ignanodon,' 'the humerus of the hylæosaurus,' and some dozen others before us, are of very great value; and to our cordial recommendation of them we beg to add the wish that they will be followed by many others.

'*Mr. Sopwith's Geological Models*' afford the same kind of assistance in studying various strata, beds of coal, and mineral veins, that the fossil models yield in the study of various organic animal remains. Plans and sections, however well they may be executed, cannot possibly impart the vivid and accurate idea which 'models' convey. Those by Mr. Sopwith are the result of actual measurement, and on a reduced scale, and exhibit most correct pictures of the objects they are to represent. They are made of various kinds of hard wood, and the workmanship they

display is remarkable for finish and beauty. We are happy to find that Mr. Sopwith's models obtained the medal of the Institution of Civil Engineers, and that from the highest quarters they are receiving the commendation they deserve, to which we have great pleasure in adding our own.

Art. VIII. *Contributions towards the Exposition of the Book of Genesis.* By Robert S. Candlish, D.D., Minister of St. George's, Edinburgh. Edinburgh, 1843. crown 8vo. pp. vi. 438.

To meet the keen and active leader of the non-intrusionists in this more private and peaceful field of pastoral labour, is a change as full of charm as that which Pitt's admirers realized when they spent an interval of leisure in his society at Dropmore, or that of Fox's friends, when leaving with them for a season the heated and stormy atmosphere of St. Stephen's chapel, he sought relaxation and relief in literature and the culture of geraniums at St. Anne's. To welcome such a change implies no disapprobation of that course of agitation and conflict with which the public at large may have been accustomed to associate the author's name. A sense of duty may, it is clear, oblige a faithful minister of Christ, in these as well as in former days, to say 'we ought to obey God rather than man,' and Dr. Candlish in this respect professes to have taken his stand upon the ground of conscience. To his own master, therefore, let him stand or fall; and we are not careful to judge him in this matter; it is the Lord that judgeth. The volume now under review invites us to a subject quite sufficient for our present leisure.

These 'Contributions' do not profess to be a complete exposition of the book of Genesis; neither are they a series of sermons or lectures upon it. They are rather essays upon some prominent topics in this earliest of all literary records—topics not requiring a minute or critical examination of the sacred text, so much as its real illustration by means of those scattered Scripture parallels which are so frequently overlooked. The author's object has been rather 'to unfold those views of the Divine government and history of man, which the general strain of the narrative in its obvious interpretation suggests;' and the title of his work has been selected as one adapted to express his design.

The essays are twenty in number, and the subjects of them are without exception interesting. Three are on creation; one on the primeval condition of the earth, and of man; two on the temptation and its fruits; one on the first patriarchal form of the dispensation of grace; one on the state of the world before the deluge; one on the deluge; three on the constitution of the

new world, in the departments of nature, providence, and grace; one on the Divine grant of the earth to man, and its occupation by Noah's descendants; and seven on as many interesting 'passages' of the life of Abraham. It has a little surprised us that no subjects have been taken from the history of the Abrahamic family subsequently to the mature age of the patriarch himself, especially as the origination of the Ishmaelites and Edomites (to say nothing of the Moabites and Ammonites, the descendants of Abraham's relative, Lot, who afterwards occupied so prominent a place in history and prophecy as the most virulent enemies of Israel) would have opened a rich field for those investigations of Providence which possess such attractions for the author; but we suppose the reason why the work stops where it does is, that enough had been prepared to fill a volume, and that a continuation of it, though not announced, will not be wanting, if the public interest in what has appeared be sufficient to encourage the author to proceed.

We have stated that the principal object of the work is the illustration of some prominent facts connected with the early history of the earth and of man, by means of passages and considerations gathered from the wide field of Scripture. Dr. Candlish has, in his preface, explained his views respecting some of the principles which have guided or assisted him in his investigations, with an explicitness, adapted, better than anything which we could say, to convey a just idea both of his object and his method.

'There are one or two principles of exposition to which reference is made in these pages, and which might admit of fuller illustration and vindication. Thus, the extent to which we may avail ourselves of the undoubted fact of an oral revelation having preceded the written Word, as affecting the manner in which that Word would probably be composed, and the kind of evidence it might be expected to afford of the leading truths of religion—the amount of acquaintance with the doctrines of the Gospel which may be presumed in the early world, as rather alluded to and taken for granted, than communicated for the first time, in God's discoveries of himself to the fathers,—the value of incidental quotations from the Old Testament, in the New, as warranting the application of hints thus given, considerably beyond the particular passages quoted,—the legitimate use of resemblances, parallelisms, and analogies occurring in the comparison of incidents and predictions, under different and far distant dispensations,—together with the limit between a sound and safe discretion and a fanciful licence, in filling up the brief sketches and outlines of the inspired record, and drawing inferences from them, (presuming upon a certain spiritual tact, or taste, or apprehension, a feeling of probability, a kind of sense of concinnity or congruity, which, even apart from such precise and palpable evidence as can be critically or logically stated,

will often give, to a rightly constituted mind, a prompt and full assurance of the mind of the Spirit;) these, and some other general inquiries, bearing upon the subject, might furnish interesting matter for several dissertations, and might in part, perhaps, be exemplified in the present exercise.'

We do not place much confidence in anything so vague as 'spiritual tact or taste,' which, as commonly understood, signifies neither more nor less than a sentiment for whose correctness no voucher can be offered but feeling, but we suspect that in these and the following expressions Dr. Candlish has darkened his own counsel with words of dubious import. A mind habitually exercised in comparing spiritual things with spiritual, and which, in reference to the objects of experience, does not rest satisfied with empty notions, but aims at realizing, in the form of experience, everything of a subjective character which is represented in the Scriptures as the fruit and the reward of a sincere and faithful adherence to the word and will of God, will doubtless discern many links in the great chain of providential causes and effects, many signs of the connexion between Divine purpose, on the one hand, and human instrumentality and its various and complicated results, on the other, which elude the observation of others; but we should hardly call this '*tact*,' or speak of it as 'a *feeling* of probability, a *kind of sense* of concinnity or congruity, which, even apart from such precise and palpable evidence as can be critically or logically stated, will often give, to a rightly constituted mind, a prompt and full assurance of the mind of the Spirit.' Dr. Candlish, writing his preface in haste, as it seems to us, has not done himself justice in this explanation; he has allowed his readers both to misunderstand him and to incur the risk of error for themselves. A truly spiritual taste or judgment, call it which we will, is not so blind and reasonless a fancy as might be inferred from these expressions. It stands in the same relation to spiritual things, as that rare faculty called common sense—a much-abused term too—stands in to common things; it is an acquired sagacity, for which some may, indeed, have a greater constitutional predisposition than others; but always, where it is a faculty under command, and applicable, at its possessor's will, to its proper objects, an acquired one which pronounces no judgments, and prescribes no conduct for which some intelligible justification cannot be rendered to the reason. We should not have noticed this accidental oversight of the author, but for the strong sense we have of the necessity of disabusing the religious world in reference to an error to which it is exceedingly prone. All persons, indeed, not those only who sustain a religious character, are too apt to be satisfied that their own minds are rightly constituted. The latter class, it must be

admitted, are usually less chargeable with arrogance in this respect. But we speak what is a fact, and known to be so, that it is a very common thing for minds which have been religiously impressed, and have become conscious of new and most important views on spiritual subjects, 'to conceive a prompt and full assurance of the mind of the Spirit, presuming upon a certain spiritual tact, or taste, or apprehension,' or even 'a feeling of probability,' or 'kind of sense of concinnity or congruity, apart from evidence,' that we consider it a matter of real and deep necessity to remind them that a spiritual judgment, and, indeed, religious experience in general, is not so blind a thing as many imagine; and that it is the duty of every Christian to build up his convictions, whether as respects faith or duty, in the clear light of Scripture evidence, and in the exercise of an ever-growing knowledge and discernment.

In other respects, the hints in this extract point out some important facts and principles connected with Scripture exposition, too much neglected on the whole, though, excepting the first, they have also, at different periods, been more or less abused by persons of imaginative habits. We should be highly pleased to see a volume of dissertations, from the pen of Dr. Candlish, illustrative of his deliberate opinions on these and the kindred inquiries referred to in his preface.

To those who know the author only as a strenuous antagonist of ecclesiastical patronage, it may be necessary to say that his volume is thoroughly evangelical in sentiment, and eminently practical in its applications. No subject is either carelessly or tamely handled; some are brought out with considerable force of argument, and firmness of delineation. As a work consisting of a Series of Essays, less is attempted in the way of touching or imaginative description, though some of the subjects—the Death of Abel—the Translation of Enoch—and the Deluge, for instance—offered fair opportunities for it, than of argumentative elucidation; and this is consequently its chief characteristic and, we may add, sufficient recommendation. That it is so, we know to our own cost, and possibly our reader's too. Twice, since the volume came into our possession, has it been abstracted, and by different parties, from our library table, and the thanks with which it was in both cases returned were all the compensation we received for being interrupted in our own perusal of it.

Amidst the many passages which might be selected as specimens of the author's manner, it is, as usual, difficult to choose; we have fixed upon the following, not for any peculiar merit distinguishing it from other parts of the volume, but on account of its relevancy to a subject which has of late years been a cause of anxiety to many inquiring minds. It is from the second essay:—

'The divine record of creation, remarkable for the most perfect simplicity, has been sadly complicated and embarrassed by the human theories and speculations with which it has unhappily become entangled. To clear the way, therefore, at the outset, to get rid of many perplexities, and leave the narrative unencumbered for pious and practical uses, let its limited design be fairly understood, and let certain explanations be frankly made.

'1. The object of this inspired cosmogony, or account of the world's origin, is not scientific, but religious. Hence it might be expected, that while nothing contained in it can ever be found really and in the long run to contradict science, the gradual progress of discovery might give occasion for apparent and temporary contradictions. For the current interpretation of the divine record in such matters will naturally accommodate itself to the actual state of scientific knowledge and opinion, so that when science takes a step in advance, revelation may seem to be left behind. The remedy here is to be found in the exercise of caution, forbearance, and suspense, on the part both of the student of Scripture and of the student of science; and, so far as Scripture is concerned, it is often safer and better to dismiss or qualify old interpretations, than instantly to adopt new ones. Let the student of science push his inquiries still farther, without too hastily assuming, in the meantime, that the result to which he has been brought demands a departure from the plain sense of Scripture. And let the student of Scripture give himself to the exposition of the narrative in its moral and spiritual application without prematurely committing himself, or it, to the particular details or principles of any scientific school.

'2. The essential facts in this divine record are, the recent state assigned to the existence of man on the earth,—the previous preparation of the earth for his habitation,—the gradual nature of the work,—and the distinction and succession of days during its progress. These are not, and cannot be, impugned by any scientific discoveries. What history of ages previous to that era this globe may have engraved in its rocky bosom, revealed or to be revealed by the explosive force of its central fires, Scripture does not say. What countless generations of living monsters teemed in the chaotic waters, or brooded over the dark abyss, it is not within the scope of the inspiring Spirit to tell. There is room and space for whole volumes of such matter before the Holy Ghost takes up the record. Nor is it necessary to suppose that all continuity of animal life which had sprung into being, in or out of the waters, was broken at the time when the earth was fashioned for man's abode. It is enough that then first the animals of the sea, and air, and land, with which man was to be conversant, were created for his use; the fish, the fowls, the beasts, which were to minister to his enjoyment and to own his dominion.

'3. The sacred narrative of the creation is evidently, in its highest character, moral, spiritual, and prophetical. The original relation of man, as a moral being, to his Maker, is directly taught. His restoration from moral chaos to spiritual beauty is figuratively represented. And as a prophecy, it has an extent of meaning which will be fully

unfolded only when 'the times of the restitution of all things' (Acts, iii. 21) have arrived. Until then, we must be contented, probably, with a partial and inadequate view of this, as of other parts of the sacred volume—'the sure word of prophecy whereunto we do well to take heed,' but which still is as 'a light shining in a dark place, until the day dawn and the day star arise in our hearts.' The precise literal sense of much that is now obscure or doubtful, as well as the bearing and importance of what may seem insignificant or irrelevant, will then clearly appear. The creation of this world anew after its final baptism of fire will be the best comment on the history of its creation at first after the chaos of water, and the manner, as well as the design of the earth's formation of old out of the water will be understood at last, when it emerges once more from the wreck and ruin of the conflagration which yet awaits it,—'a new earth, with new heavens, wherein righteousness is to dwell.' (2 Peter, iii. 13.)—pp. 19—22.

In perusing this volume, we have been occasionally reminded of several different—indeed very different—writers. Under the seventh and tenth essays, in particular, we were reminded of the late Mr. Roby's useful volume on the evidences and dispensations of religion, a work, simple in character, but eminently adapted for the young. At other times, Mr. Forster's discourses on subjects of scripture history were strongly recalled to our recollection, but rather from an occasional similarity of manner than any other coincidence, for Mr. Forster's sermons all belong to a later period of Bible history. At other times, again, we have caught a glimpse of Dr. Russell, of Dundee, who, both in his letters, and, if we mistake not, in his two publications on the dispensations and covenants, has made use of the psalms in the same broad style of application as Dr. Candlish has done. But of all who have written congenially, on congenial themes, the writer who has reappeared most frequently to us, is the author's friend, Dr. Robert Gordon, whose energy in argument, and urgency of application, find at times almost a counterpart in the present volume. We have named these several writers, not exclusively for the purpose of suggesting to those who are familiar with them, some idea of Dr. Candlish's work, but with the further design of assisting those whose interest in such studies may have been stirred up by the perusal of it to additional entertainment and instruction.

We close this notice with our hearty recommendation, and an example of the author's manner in deducing and applying practical lessons from the historical materials supplied to him. It is taken from the narrative respecting Hagar.

'Accordingly, the sequel of this part of Abraham's history is sufficiently sad. Viewed merely as a domestic scene, which might be realized in any ordinary household, how true is it to nature, and how emphatic is the warning which it holds out.

'The jealousies, the heartburnings, and mutual reproaches which we now find disturbing the peace of this pious family are such as might have been anticipated from the course of policy unhappily pursued. That the Egyptian bondmaid so strangely and suddenly honoured, taken out of her due place and station, and admitted to the rank and privileges of a spouse, should forget herself and become high-minded, was precisely such conduct as might have been expected on the part of a slave treated as Hagar was, and having a temper unsubdued, and a mind uninstructed, as Hagar's probably were. She could not enter into the plan which the heads of the house had formed, or into the reasons and motives which led them to form it. To their servant, if not to themselves, it must have been fraught with a vitiating and corrupting tendency; and assuredly it did prove to her a temptation to insolence and insubordination stronger than she could withstand. Hence Abram and Sarai had the greater sin. There was a cruel want of consideration in what they did. Even if they felt that they were at liberty, so far as they themselves were concerned, to do it, that they were safe in doing it, were they not bound to ask how it might affect their dependant, whom they made a party in the transaction?

'Is not this the duty of all heads of families? Alas! how is it discharged? Do parents and masters,—do the heads and members of households among Christians, duly weigh and recognise their responsibility in this particular? Do you,—we might say to them in all affection,—do you, with special reference to this consideration, apply the maxim—'all things are lawful unto me, but all things edify not'?

'You have a system of conventional falsehoods in the intercourse of refined society, by which you do not impose upon one another, for you all know what is meant. But how does the system tell upon your domestics,—your children, perhaps, whom you employ as your assistants,—whom you admit into your confidence,—whom you make prematurely familiar with the hollow insincerity of a smiling world?

'Or take your recreations, your amusements, and your gay entertainments. Let it be granted that they do you personally little or no harm; that you can stand the exhaustion of body and the dissipation of mind which they cause. What are your inferiors to think, or how are they to be affected as they see you, week after week, turning night into day,—the early dawn finding you amid the glare and heat of the crowded hall, and the sumptuous feast,—while the hours of their sleepless waiting without have been beguiled with coarser revelry? To you all may seem innocent and fair,—to them, as the inevitable condition of your sport, what temptation is there, what deadly sin!

'Even in families less worldly, and more truly serious and devoted, is there enough of care taken to walk circumspectly, and to avoid the very appearance of evil? Ye who are at the head of a pious household, or who make up the holy and happy circle at morning and evening prayers,—do you, in your general conversation, and in all your plans and arrangements, consider the interests of your domestics as well as your own? What you practise in the way of ease or indulgence,—what you propose as a measure of expediency and almost of necessity —may be partly justifiable, so far as you yourselves are concerned, and

with the explanations which you can give. You may be able to make out that it does not altogether discredit your Christian profession or mar your spiritual welfare. Ah! but in what light will this or that scheme of policy, and this or that course of conduct appear to those around you, and under you, whom you must assume into your councils —whom perhaps you use as your instruments or your allies? How will they interpret your occasional omission or your perfunctory discharge of sacred duty ; or your rare instances of what you call indispensable conformity to the world. What encouragement may your failings give to their sins? What seeds of evil may thus be sown in their minds? What devout impressions may be effaced—what holy desires quenched—what ungodly passions and worldly lusts fostered and revived?

'How is it that we have such incessant complaints of the vices and faults to which your inferiors are prone?—of the insolence of servants, their want of atttchment, and their want of principle? For how many of these evils are you yourselves responsible ? Sarai was provoked by the frowardness of Hagar, and she thought she did well to be angry. She was loud in her reproaches, and even spoke indignantly to her lord. Alas! had she forgotten that all this was but the fruit of her own device; that as she had sown so she reaped.'—pp. 401—404.

Art. IX. 1. *A Bill for Regulating the Employment of Children and Young Persons in Factories, and for the Better Education of Children in Factory Districts.* Ordered to be printed, 7th March, 1843.

2. *A Plea for Liberty of Conscience: A Letter to the Right Hon. Sir James Graham, Bart., on the Educational Clauses of the Factories Bill.* By John Howard Hinton, M.A. London: Houlston and Stoneman.

3. *Why Not? or, Seven Objections to the Educational Clauses of the Factories Regulation Bill.* By John Howard Hinton. Houlston and Stoneman.

4. *The Bill; or, the Alternative: A Letter to the Right Hon. Sir James Graham, Bart., M.P.* By Henry Dunn. London: Ward and Co.

5. *An Analytical Digest of the Educational Clauses of the Factories Bill now before Parliament; with Observations and Objections, to which are added Practical Suggestions to the Opponents of the Bill.* London: James Dinnis.

6. *On the Educational Clauses of the Bill now before the House of Commons, 'for regulating the employment of children and young persons in Factories, and for the better education of children in Factory districts.'* By W. J. Fox. London: C. Fox.

7. *The Rights of Conscience; an Argument occasioned by the Educational Clauses of the Factories Bill.* By Edward Steane, D.D. London: G. and J. Dyer.
8. *Letter to the Right Hon. Lord Wharncliffe, Chairman of the Committee of Council on Education, on Sir James Graham's Bill for establishing exclusive Church Schools, built and supported out of the Poor's-rates, and discouraging British Schools and Sunday Schools.* By Edward Baines, Jun. London: T. Ward and Co.
9. *Church Education Considered.* London: G. and J. Dyer.
10. *Twenty Reasons for Petitioning against and otherwise opposing the Educational Clauses of the Factories Bill recently introduced to Parliament by Sir James Graham.* By Rev. W. Thorn, Winchester.
11. *Letter to Sir James Graham, Bart., on the Educational Clauses of the Factory Bill; with an Appendix, containing Lord John Russell's Resolutions and Remarks thereon.* By James Cook Evans, Esq. London: Ward.
12. *No Modifications; A Letter, addressed to the Right Hon. Lord John Russell.* By Rev. F. A. Cox, D.D. London: Ward.

We live in times wherein the elements of good and evil are strangely blended. Viewed under some aspects they are full of promise, and under others, are ominous of evil. They are hopeful or alarming, indicative of advancement or of retrogression, accordingly as they are regarded on a wider or a narrower scale. Severed from the past, they awaken apprehension and dread, but if interpreted by its records, if read in connexion with the lessons those records inculcate, they will be regarded only as the momentary recoil of a vast tide whose waters are steadily advancing. For some years past the principles of religious liberty have been making steady progress amongst us. They have won converts from every class, and have been adopted, at least in their phraseology, by their old and hereditary opponents. The great mass of the more thoughtful and religious part of our countrymen have become their intelligent advocates, and the consequence has been, the erasure from our statute books of some of those laws which the intolerant bigotry of a former age had passed. Catholic emancipation announced the turn of the tide, and in connexion with the abolition of the Test and Corporation Acts, gave promise of equal civil rights, irrespective of religious opinions, to all classes of British subjects. From that period the progress of religious liberty has been favoured alike by the growing intelligence of the age and the political changes which we have lived to witness; and the consequence has been a general conviction of its having struck its roots so deeply into the hearts of the people as to ensure its perpetual

safety. It may be, that in the simplicity of our faith we have overlooked some of the counteracting influences which are yet in operation. We have calculated, perhaps credulously so, on the steadiness of the movement, on its unchecked progress, on the silent acquiescence of foes, and the gradual, but certain unfolding of the public mind to the purer and nobler influences with which religious liberty is fraught. A larger knowledge of history, a more heedful regard to the lessons taught by the struggles and reverses of our fathers, would have guarded effectually against all such expectations, and have exempted us from the bitter disappointment which the present measure has in some quarters inflicted.

The history of our country is full of instruction on this point. At no period has the onward movement continued unchecked during any extended series of years. The English mind is eminently practical, not far-sighted. It acts under the impulse of existing grievance, seeks relief from present evil, and is in consequence disposed, when its immediate object is attained, to remit exertion, and to indulge itself in repose. There has been, however, permanent progression in connexion with temporary defeats,—the steady advancement of the national intellect in knowledge and liberality, notwithstanding occasional outbreaks of intolerance and bigotry. The times of the Commonwealth were succeeded by the Restoration, when piety was placed under an interdict, and conscience was laughed to scorn. The principles which had been evolved from the struggles of the civil war were suppressed by the duplicity of priests and the iron sway of Clarendon, and it might well have been concluded by the observer of passing events, that they were destined to a long, if not an eternal eclipse. A momentary resurrection, however, was effected even during the reign of the second Charles, but the public mind had not sufficiently recovered itself, and the blood of Russell and Sydney, in consequence, paved the way for the unrelieved bigotry of James. A speedy reaction, however, ensued. The infatuated monarch, before whom protestant bishops and a protestant university had preached the doctrine of passive obedience, touched the temporalities of the church, and these holy fathers forgot instantly their professions, and adopted for the hour the phraseology of freemen. The revolution of 1688, which followed, rescued our liberties, civil and religious, from the grasp of the brutal tyrant, and promised a more permanent form to liberty; but not many years elapsed before the nation was cursed by the dotage of Anne and the frenzy of a Sacheverel mob. In later times we have witnessed similar reactions, and need not therefore be alarmed at the events which are now passing before us. Exhausted by the efforts which carried the Reform Bill,

and disappointed at the timid and vacillating policy of Whig ministers, the public mind has sunk into repose,—has lost much of its fervour,—has been divested, in appearance at least, of its former resolution and purpose. It is but in the natural course of things that the oppressors of conscience and the enemies of liberty should take advantage of this interval. Knowing that their time is short, they have bestirred themselves vigorously for its improvement, and we see the result. Their active bigotry has brought on a crisis, perhaps prematurely for themselves, and we know little of our countrymen if it does not search deeply into their hearts. Other things might have been borne with, patiently,—nay, criminally borne with, but the invasion of religious liberty, the violence done to conscience, is an unpardonable sin, which must arouse the timid as well as the bold, and call forth into stern and indomitable resistance those principles of action before which the chicanery of politicians and the combinations of party are but folly and weakness. The elements which were previously feeble, because scattered, have thus been brought into combination, and who shall estimate their power?

Sir James Graham's Bill, which has given occasion to these remarks, has done more to arouse dissenters, and to place them in their proper attitude, than anything which has occurred since Lord Sidmouth's abortive effort to cripple their ministry. This bill was ushered into parliament by a speech as delusive as statesman ever delivered. 'All party or religious differences' were to be laid aside, in order that some neutral ground might be found upon which—'a due regard being paid to the just wishes of the established church on the one hand, and to the honest scruples of dissenters on the other'—a scheme of national education might be built up. 'There was no party or personal feeling,' remarked Sir James, 'that would not be gladly surrendered by him if he could but hope that he would be the humble instrument of proposing to the House anything approaching to a scheme which would lead to so desirable a consummation.' Such was the language, such were the professions, with which one of Her Majesty's secretaries of state deemed it befitting to introduce a measure, the main features of which are in open hostility to the rights of conscience, and whose details evidence a bigotry as blind and rancorous as would have suited the ministers of a Stuart. So completely was the House entrapped by the liberal professions of the right honourable baronet, that Lord John Russell, while reserving his opinion on the details of the bill, affirmed, 'it would not only be folly, it would be absolute wickedness, to oppose it,' and other members on both sides of the House hailed the measure as at once comprehensive and satisfactory. So palpable, indeed, is the discrepancy between the

speech and the bill, that it is impossible to relieve the Home Secretary from the charge of gross ignorance, or of intentional misrepresentation. He either did not know the provisions and spirit of the measure, or knowing them, he misled the House in order to facilitate its introduction. We must leave our readers to adopt which alternative they please. It is enough for our purpose to note the discrepancy, which is of an order characteristic of the present tactics of the Tory party. It is no solitary instance this, of intolerance, seeking to veil itself under the disguise of liberal professions. The obvious design was to force the bill rapidly through the House, without drawing attention to its educational clauses. This, however, has happily been prevented by the vigilance of the dissenting body, and it remains to be seen whether the government will persist in a measure against which so strong and general a protest has been uttered. The suspicious manner in which the bill was introduced is ably exposed by Mr. Evans in his stringent, and for the most part admirable pamphlet.

'In the first place I hear it objected on every side, *that it was brought forward in a most unfair manner, as the remedy for an evil which was greatly exaggerated.* You, Sir James, had been for some time intending to bring forward this very bill. It was already prepared, and was ready to be laid upon the table of the House. You had it in your pocket; but instead of coming forward in the usual way, and stating the provisions of the bill, you waited until my Lord Ashley, a most amiable and benevolent man, had brought forward his statement respecting the manufacturing districts. This statement, highly coloured as it was, and holding forth to the view of the House of Commons *all* the ignorance, *all* the irreligion, *all* the vice, and *all* the moral depravity of every kind existing in those districts, but picturing *none* of the knowledge, *none* of the virtue, *none* of the piety, and *none* of the goodness of every kind which exists there in a much higher degree than in some other parts of the kingdom,—such a statement was naturally calculated to excite the feelings of the House of Commons and of the country, and to create the momentary belief that *any remedy* for such a state of things would be most welcome. At such a time, did you, Sir James, rise and propound your remedy for this disease in that part of the body politic. No doubt, Sir, you thought your strategy most excellent; but let me remind you that such stratagems, however successful they may at first appear, usually defeat themselves. However bad those districts may seem to be, when only the *dark portions* of the picture are made visible, we well know that the large manufacturing towns are the seats of industry, intelligence, virtue, and religion. We know that, if a fair estimate be made, they do not yield to London itself, the ancient Metropolis of the empire, the residence of the Court, the seat of the wealthiest Aristocracy in the world, and the abode of the Hierarchy for half the year. Why,

then, should Manchester and Leeds be so blackened with infamy? Oh, if Lord Ashley had so great an appetite for picturing vice, why did he travel so far as Manchester? Is there not enough in London, not enough in Westminster? He might have indulged his appetite without stint in the very vicinity of the House of Commons. He might have described to them the precincts of Westminster Abbey; and where that Abbey casts its shadow on the dense mass of human vice and misery before it, he might have found more to excite the compassion of the House than even in the most abject parts of Manchester. He might have found a more vicious population, more houses of ill-fame and black repute than in any other place in the whole kingdom; and that, too, on the estates of the established church itself, the land of the Dean and Chapter of Westminster, who, while they make it a condition in all their leases that no worship not according to the rites of the established church shall be celebrated on their property, do yet connive at, and willingly permit the existence of resorts of infamy, to which it is believed no spot of equal size in the whole world can present a parallel. There is a saying, Sir, which appears almost to be forgotten by some parties, that 'Charity begins at home;' and another, that 'Justice begins at home.' How then can we explain the fact, that Lord Ashley journeyed to Manchester to picture vice, and you to prescribe for it? I will tell you, Sir James, how I have heard this difficulty explained. It is said, and I believe with perfect truth, that *here*, in Westminster, the *church* reigns; that in Manchester, *dissent* has in great part remedied the defects of the establishment; and that your bill is intended, not so much to correct *Ignorance*, as *Nonconformity*, —not so much to destroy *Vice*, as *Dissent*.'—p. 4.

Considerable differences of opinion exist, even amongst dissenters, respecting the propriety of government interfering to any extent, or in any mode, in the matter of education. The question is a large one undoubtedly, demanding grave consideration, and not to be hastily dispatched. It is a fearful alternative to which we are left by the negative proposition; yet by that negative we are prepared to abide. It appears to us, after much consideration of the matter, to be the only one which consists with the legitimate functions of government; and to be most conducive, viewed on the large scale, to the welfare of the community. We admit the ignorance which prevails, and the obligation which rests upon us to attempt its removal. There is no difference on these points, and it is both paltry and unprincipled in our opponents to allege the contrary. The question at issue respects simply the mode in which such removal shall be attempted; and the more distinctly this is kept in mind, the more certainly shall we arrive at a satisfactory conclusion.

The province of government respects simply the persons and property of its subjects. The protection of these constitutes its legitimate objects, and is clearly enforced by the very nature of

the relation subsisting. To the obligations resulting from that relation there must be some limit. They cannot be indefinite, nor are they unintelligible. They are fixed and immutable; not admitting, on the one hand, of diminution at the bidding of an incapable and slothful government, nor on the other, of being extended to meet the views and accomplish the design of a misjudging and despotic one. If permitted to prevail beyond the limits we have stated, where are their bounds to be fixed? If government be warranted to interfere with one branch of parental duty—we are now speaking, be it remembered, of *secular* education only—why not with another? If it may take upon itself to force the parent to send his child to the school, why not to the workshop? If it may guard against ignorance on account of the evils which flow from it, why not against indolence, from which equal, if not greater vices flow? But enough of this: we have so much yet before us, that we must reluctantly refrain from following out this branch of our subject.

Mr. Fox, in whose pamphlet there is much acute and able reasoning, not only admits the propriety of government's interference, but "does not object to the principle of compulsory education." He maintains that "the child has a moral right to instruction," and that "to keep it in ignorance is an abuse of parental power, not less gross than the physical injuries which law has long since interposed to restrain." The right of the child and the failure of duty on the part of the parent, in the case supposed, we admit; but the parallel instituted we deny. If the *right* of the child, not being met by the parent, justifies the interference of government in the matter of education, then what bounds are to be set to its interposition? The child is equally entitled, to say the least, to *religious* instruction; he ought to be trained up in the ways of piety, to be taken to the house of worship, to be taught the character of the Divine government, the import of its revelations, and the nature of its rewards and punishments. To keep him in ignorance of these "is an abuse of parental power," from which far more serious evils flow than from ignorance of mere *secular* knowledge. Are we then prepared to maintain—is Mr. Fox, we ask, prepared to maintain, that government should interpose, in this case, to supply what the parent has failed to communicate? We see no other alternative than the extension or the abandonment of his argument. If sound in the one case, it is equally so in the other; if inadmissible in the matter of religion, whatever appearance of force it has in that of education, must be illusive. But he further urges, that "society has so deep an interest in the qualification of its members to discharge their duties and improve their advantages, that the propriety of its (the government's) interference is obvious." To this we

reply, that whatever there is in secular education to qualify for the discharge of duty, there is much more in religious; and that, therefore, if it be sound in the former case to reason from such tendency to the propriety of government interference, greatly more so is it in the latter. Society is far more deeply interested in the religious than in the secular instruction of the young; yet who amongst us would admit the propriety of enforcing, by a penalty, the communication of Scripture history or doctrines.

But Mr. Fox's argument leads on to another, and, in our judgment, most weighty objection to any government being entrusted with the education of the people. So far from society being benefited thereby, it is our deliberate and solemn conviction, that its highest interests are fearfully jeoparded—that an amount of influence is thereby conceded to government, which no friend of popular liberty should contemplate without alarm—that a new and more potent element than any we have hitherto known, is thereby introduced, which must materially affect the relation of the parties, and give to the governor over the governed an all but omnipotent sway. It is no trifling thing to commit to any hands the moulding of the minds of men. An immense power is thus communicated, the tendency of which will be in exact accordance with the spirit and policy of those who use it. Governments, it is well known, are conservative. The tendency of official life is notorious, and it is the height of folly, the mere vapouring of credulity, to imagine that the educational system, if entrusted to the minister of the day, will not be employed to diffuse amongst the rising generation, that spirit and those views which are most friendly to his policy. By having, virtually, at his command, the whole machinery of education, he will cover the land with a new class of officials, whose dependence on his patronage will render them the ready instruments of his pleasure. One class of officials already exist in the parochial clergy, and the direction of their influence is notorious. In almost every parish they are known as the active agents of tory partizanship; and why should we expect a different result in the case of that class which it is now proposed to institute. In some respects we fear the results would be more fearful. They might not be so immediate; they would not for a time be so apparent; but, as youth is more pliable than manhood, and the schoolmaster is more continuously with his charge than the clergyman, we fear that the ultimate consequences would be more fatal. Government influence, the spirit of toryism to which it so commonly gives rise, would be brought into contact with the human mind at its most susceptible age, and could scarcely fail to produce an emasculated and servile generation, possessed, it

may be, of the simpler elements of knowledge, but destitute of the free spirit and brave thoughts which constitute the noblest heritage of man. We marvel much that our liberal politicians do not perceive this danger, or that perceiving it, they do not join heart and soul in resistance to a measure which threatens such evils. It has hitherto been matter of solicitude with the advocates of freedom to limit rather than to strengthen the prerogatives of the Crown—to add weight to the popular rather than to the monarchical branch of the constitution,—to protect the popular intellect and will from the minister of the day, rather than to subject their earliest and most plastic movements to his pleasure. There is a tendency in power as in wealth, to increase itself. It has means at its command, the legitimate use of which cannot fail to multiply its worshippers, and thus strengthen its own position. Hence, tyranny has, in many cases, grown out of the simpler and least objectionable forms of sovereignty. Its earlier stages were sustained by crime; its development was slow, but steady. There was nothing to alarm, nothing to arouse suspicion, but it gradually grew and swelled until its portentous form defied opposition, and overshadowed all that was noble and generous in the land. It has been the special vocation of our noblest senators—the men, whose memory constitutes our pride and glory—to counteract this tendency. Aware of its existence, they have sought to raise up barriers against its encroachments, and have placed their fullest confidence on the healthful independence and free respiration of the public mind. But what confidence can be felt, what hope entertained, if the fountain whence our children drink be committed to the keeping of power, if its waters be tampered with by government officials, and its healthful qualities destroyed—as will inevitably in such case ensue—by the infusion of deleterious, if not poisonous drugs. Yet so infatuated are our statesmen—if statesmen they may be called—that in the face of all these dangers, and at the hazard of everything which Englishmen should hold dear, they are loud in their demand for a system, the establishment of which would be the knell of English freedom, by the fearful addition it must make to the already overgrown prerogatives of the Crown.

The consequences of such a system are visible in Europe, and they confirm our worst fears. The military despotism of Prussia is mainly upheld at the present day by its educational system. The national intellect is there held in bondage, everything is stereotyped after the fashion of the court, and freedom vainly seeks for itself an utterance amidst the servile crowd which this system has trained to manhood. But even this precedent, lauded as it has been by the advocates of compulsory education, is outstripped by our government measure,

which 'compels everything about education, but does not compel education itself; restrains, wherever restraint is needlessly offensive; is lax only where it would be useful; and has all the odiousness of Prussian compulsion, without its impartiality, without its liberty of choice, without its adaptation to religious differences, and without its security for the actual result.'*

We are, of course, aware that the full force of this objection will not be felt at first. It applies rather to the tendencies of a government system, than to the specific form which that system may originally bear. Some concession will at first be made, some safeguards from ministerial influence be proposed, some measure of popular control be conceded; but once admit the principle, and the centralizing tendencies of this age will soon vest in the minister of the day all real and substantial power. The concession will be limited and temporary, whilst the extension of power, the growth of government influence, will be advancing and permanent. The necessities of the case will be pleaded in justification of the encroachments made, and at each step of the process the opposition will become more feeble. The case, as it at present exists, is a simple one, and may be easily dealt with, but hereafter it will be complicated by a thousand considerations serving to perplex the judgment and to divide the forces of opponents. Here, then, we should take our stand—firmly and fearlessly take it—unmoved on the one hand by the seductions of pecuniary aid, and unalarmed on the other by the fearful evils which flow from popular ignorance.

Hitherto we have treated this question in its secular bearings only, but it has other and higher relations, which must not be passed over, and from which our strongest objections are drawn. Every scheme hitherto propounded has been more or less of a religious complexion, and the measure now before parliament and the country is emphatically of this kind. To such an extent, indeed, is this the case, that, as is remarked by the author of the admirable *Analytical Digest,* on the subject of *secular* instruction, 'the bill does not contain a single word; nor does it afford any security that *any* instruction will be given beyond the catechism and liturgy of the established church, and whatever else of religious instruction the clerical trustee may give or direct to be given.'

The religious—understanding by that term the distinctive tenets and spirit of the hierarchy—is clearly the paramount object of the measure. This is perfectly natural—harmonizes most exactly with the sentiments of its framers, and is most pertinent to their design. They have no high estimate of educa-

* Fox, p. 7.

tion as such; they care not one whit about it; they have been, as a party, its sworn and inveterate opponents, and only now, at the eleventh hour, are induced to come forward as its advocates, in the hope of converting its machinery into another buttress of their tottering church. This design is conspicuous throughout every part of the educational clauses of their bill, so as to rivet the attention of all parties, and to have awakened a resistance more simultaneous and powerful than anything which modern dissent had previously exhibited. Hence arises a grave question, involving the first elements of religious freedom, and, by necessary implication, the whole principle of an established church. Now, we contend that the religious education of children lies without the province of government—that it is not included within its commission—and cannot be attempted in any form, or to any extent, without hazarding a thousand-fold more evil than it accomplishes good. Government has nothing more to do with the religious training of children than with that of adults, and is as much open to rebuke in the former as in the latter case, for a profane intrusion into a province too spiritual for its gross appliances, and too holy for its secular bearing. Dr. Steane, at the conclusion of his lucid and conclusive *Argument*, has put this case well, when he remarks, 'It is not, then, as objecting to the religious education of children that we denounce the government plan; but it is first, and mainly, because government cannot interfere with religion, whether in the sanctuary or the schoolroom, without intruding into a province where its voice has no right to be heard, and into which, if it does intrude, it intrudes only to do irreparable mischiefs—to sow dissension, to create strife, to establish a system of favouritism on the one hand, and of oppression on the other; to curtail liberty, to silence reason, to extinguish conscience, and to lay the honour of Christianity in the dust.'

We do not at present advert to the more specific forms of religious training which are instituted by Sir James Graham's bill. To these we shall briefly advert presently. We refer to religious training, as such, in its more simple and unobjectionable forms, and contend without hesitancy or fear, that it is beside the province of legislation, and cannot be undertaken by it without inflicting incalculable mischief upon religion itself, and doing a wrong to conscience for which nothing can atone. Upon this subject, remarks Mr. Hinton, in his masterly letter to Sir James—

'I disclaim at the outset all opposition on sectarian grounds. It is true that I am a dissenter; but it is not merely because I am a dissenter that I am aggrieved by the Factories Bill. It may be disagreeable to me to see the religious sect which is wedded to the state acquire by this bill, if it shall become law, a further augmentation of its already

dominant, and, in my opinion, most pernicious influence; but were it not so, and were I on the winning rather than the losing side in this contest for power, I should see the same objections to the bill which I now see, and I trust I should have the manliness as forcibly to urge them. In one word, I plead for neither sect nor party—I plead for CONSCIENCE, and its righteous and inviolable liberty.'—p. 4.

Mr. Hinton has superseded the necessity for our enlarging on this branch of the question, by the compact and conclusive reasoning which he has brought to bear upon it. We have seldom read an argument more complete or overwhelming, more consistent in itself, or more clearly leading to the right conclusion. Fearless of the consequences to which his principles may conduct, he honestly traces them out, states them in broad and perspicuous terms, and abides by them without alarm or hesitancy. The logical consistency of his mind is strikingly shewn in the tenour of his reasoning, and we rejoice both in his honesty and his fearlessness. The following extract, though somewhat too extended for our space, expresses our views so fully that we must transcribe it.

'I repel this intrusion of the secular power into the sphere of religious duties the more jealously, because it lays a foundation for further interference. It is an opening of the door to a visitor, who, when he has once entered, may busy himself with many more things than that which constituted his first errand.

'If I sanction the claim of the government to enforce by civil penalties one of my religious duties, I cannot dispute its right to extend its administration to the rest. When I have permitted it to require that I shall religiously educate my children, on what principle could I complain, if it were to enact that I should assemble them daily at family prayer, and take them to chapel on Sundays? To admit the principle of the Factories Bill, would be to lay a basis for acts of parliament regulating my religious treatment of others besides my children, and my religious deportment universally. This kind of interference once allowed, it can stop only at the good pleasure of the intruding party. The fence, which preserved the sacred enclosure of religious duty from unhallowed steps, is thenceforward broken down, and the bulwark of religious liberty is destroyed. Who shall afterwards protect it from aggressions of every kind? There is no safety for this precious and inestimable treasure, but in a steadfast resistance of the first intrusion.

'I thus lay it down, that, even if this act of legislation finds me a Christian, and willing to do the thing required, it violates the sacred principle of religious liberty in relation to the specific duty enforced, wrests from me the right of private judgment as to the nature and obligations of religion, and breaches the bulwark by which alone my practical liberty as a Christian is defended.

'This, however, is only one part of the case. Let me now, in the second instance, suppose myself to be, not a Christian—a Jew, for example, or one of those unhappy persons who eschew religion alto-

gether, and denounce it as a gainful fraud—an infidel of some class, a socialist, a deist, or, if you please, an atheist—all of them entities in England. Assuming myself to be such an one, I denounce your educational scheme as a direct practical violation of my conscience. I believe Christianity to consist of a mass of fictions taken advantage of by artful priests, and yet the government requires me to have these hated notions wrought into the mind of my child by education, and subjects me to punishment if I refuse to comply. What is this short of trampling on the rights of my conscience? What is it short of both the spirit and the practice of persecution?

'I may be told that, in rejecting the Bible, either in whole or in part, I resist the clearest evidence, and that, in denouncing Christianity, I do utter injustice to its character. Perhaps so; but nevertheless, I do reject the Bible, and denounce Christianity, and it is my duty to act according to my views. Thinking as I do, to give a Christian training to my child would be to make myself a traitor to his best interests, as I understand them; and I could not do it without violating some of the most solemn obligations which lie upon me as a parent. Yet this is what you demand of me; and, if I refuse it, you inflict a penalty!

'For what, then, is it that you punish me? For hypocrisy—for fraud—for neglect of parental duty—for doing injury to my children, or to the community? Far from it. You punish me for conscientiousness—for parental fidelity—for guarding my child, and through him the community, against what I deem pernicious errors!

'I may further ask, what it is that you wish me to become? You will have me send my children to be taught Christianity, and, if I do, you will reward me by opening to them the channels of remunerative industry. And this while you know that I abhor the Bible as false, and the church as a fraud. That is, you attach a bounty to hypocrisy! You will pay me handsomely for being a knave! You will reward me liberally if I will be a wicked parent, and betray the souls of my children!

'You tell me, possibly, that it is only religious education you are enforcing, not religion. Only education! Education, more than all things besides, moulds the character and makes the man. You had better require me to bring my children for baptism. The same principle would justify you, and the children would suffer less harm.

'It may be that you say the penalty is small. I will not condescend to reply to this that the penalty is not small *to me*, or to say that the employment of my children in a factory is their only refuge from starvation. My answer is, in two words, that what renders a penalty galling is not its magnitude, but its injustice; and that the principle which sanctions a small penalty will equally sanction a great one. If you may prevent my children from getting their bread because I will not permit a Christian training to be given them, why may you not, for the same offence, imprison, banish, or execute me?

'You reply to me, perhaps, that, in this matter, you are right and I am wrong. Ay; and so said the venerable gentlemen of the In-

quisition before you. This has been the invariable plea of the persecutor, throughout the entire history of the world. Many a time has it been written in the blood of martyrs; and the very same principle on which you now impoverish me, would justify you, if you wrote it in mine. All that it means is, that you are determined to think for me, and will not suffer me to think for myself.

'You might further rejoin to me, that, in holding such sentiments as I avow, you cannot believe me conscientious. Suppose, then, I retaliate, and say that I do not believe you to be conscientious. Certainly I should have the best side in such an argument, for you get much more by your religion than I do by my infidelity. But where would this strife end? Or what could silence a system of crimination which would soon become universal, short of the conclusion that, in such a matter, none of us is entitled to judge another? You say you are conscientious, and it is fit that I should believe you; but why is this more fit, than that you should believe me when I say the same thing?

'I re-assert, then, that, since I am not a Christian, a law which compels me to educate my child as a Christian, tramples my conscience in the dust. It prohibits my doing what my judgment dictates, and enforces on me what my judgment condemns. Where then are my conscientious rights? Set at nought by the legislators! Where is my religious liberty? Under the hoofs of an iniquitous law!—pp. 6—10.

If it be within the province of government, as such, to undertake the religious education of children, then it must be equally incumbent on all governments to do so. If it be part of their duty, it must be enforced in all circumstances, and under every possible variety of religious faith. Whether in Britain or Rome, Constantinople or Pekin, it must be alike attempted; and as the right of governors is but correlative with the duty of the governed, it will be incumbent on the latter, in all these cases, cheerfully to acquiesce in the will of their rulers. No objector can be tolerated, no dissent allowed, for the obligation is imperative, and submission must be absolute.

'It may be said,' observes Mr. Hinton, 'that those religions are false, while Christianity is true. That is to say, we think so; nothing more. And others think their systems as true as we deem Christianity. Besides, the prevalence of religions, false or true, does not alter principles of government. What is right in one case is right in another, and right in all. And if the possession of the true religion should occasion any difference, it surely ought to make a government so favoured more tenderly alive to the rights of conscience than the rest.

'The principle may be tested, however, without going abroad. If it be right in the British government to enforce a religious education now, it is difficult to see how it could have been wrong to have done so when the nation was immersed in paganism on the one hand, or in popery on the other. Nor could what is now right become wrong,

of course, if the religion of this country should change—an event far from impossible—and become Romanist, or even pagan, again. In either of these cases, however, the thing meant by religious education will essentially differ from what is now meant by it; and we must conclude, either that it is equally right for a government to insist on the children being made protestants at one time, papists at another, and pagans at a third, or else that it is wrong to meddle with their religious education at all.—p. 12.

We have preferred dwelling the more largely on these general discussions, from the fact of their having received far less notice than they merit. Public attention has been engrossed with the details of the government measure, and the principles which pervade it, and on which, in fact, it is based, have consequently slipped out of view. A host of writers, and speakers by the hundred, have dwelt on the anomalous and intolerant character of its provisions. The public judgment has been pronounced unequivocally on these points, but we regret to acknowledge that there has been a want of distinctness and consistency in the general views advocated. Partial glimpses of the truth have occasionally been visible; but, for the most part, the leaders of the movement have evidently been unprepared to follow out principles to their legitimate conclusions. They have hesitated and talked in equivocal strains, when they ought to have warned off, in terms not admitting of misconstruction, an intruding power. An occasion is now afforded for the dissemination of great and influential principles. The public mind is aroused from its usual torpor, and the seeds of truth, to bear blessed fruit at some future day, may be easily scattered around us. Shall we improve or shall we lose this opportunity? Shall we content ourselves with warding off the threatened evil, and thus leaving ourselves exposed to its recurrence?—or shall we take advantage of our position to enlighten the public mind—to raise up an impregnable barrier of principle—to guard at once our liberty and our religion from their most subtle and dangerous foe? It is in no querulous temper that we propose these inquiries, but in an earnest and deep solicitude to obtain for our views the consideration which they claim. Let them be examined—gravely, candidly, honestly examined—and if their evidence be not conclusive in their favour, let them by all means be rejected. We ask for nothing more than this, and confidently abide the issue.

If the principle of government interference with education be admitted, no form of such interference is open to less objection than that which is set forth in Mr. Dunn's pamphlet, with all the advantages of his practical knowledge, and the lucid order and comprehensive perception of the great question which

are characteristic of his mind. For the reasons, however, already set forth, we are compelled to dissent from the principle on which the greater part of his reasoning is based.

Before closing our remarks, we must briefly advert to the more specific objections which lie against the government measure, in which, however, we are greatly relieved by Mr. Hare's *Analytical Digest* of the bill, which we take this opportunity of *strongly recommending to the early and careful perusal of our readers.* The following summary of objections is taken from Mr. Baynes's Letter to Lord Wharncliffe, one of the earliest and most effective exposures of the nefarious scheme. In the eighth objection, which refers to the constitution of the board of management, Mr. Baynes has omitted to state that the granter of a site on which to erect a school house is constituted a permanent trustee.

'1st. The bill, *for the first time*, enacts that schools shall be *built* and *supported*, where any of the great manufactures are carried on, partly out of the *poor's-rate*. *Two-thirds* of the sum required for building a school may be advanced out of *public money*—viz., *one-third* from the Parliamentary grant through the Committee of Council, and *one-third* out of the *poor's-rate*. Whatever deficiency may exist in the means for the *annual support* of the school is also to be paid out of the *poor's-rate*.

'2nd. The rate-payers are not, directly or indirectly, to have any species of control or influence over the schools, nor any check upon the expenditure.

'3rd. The bill not only for the first time authorizes the building and maintenance of schools out of the poor's-rate, but it also for the first time places schools, thus paid for out of the public money, *under the control and management of the clergy of the established church*, and with such provisions as would make them *exclusively* church schools.

'4th. The bill provides no assistance whatever for any other class of schools.

'5th. It actually *forbids* the *employment* of a child in any manufacture *who does not attend one of these church schools*,—except only that children may attend a National school, a British and Foreign school, or a school within the factory where they work, but only after those schools shall have been reported by an inspector of schools to be 'efficiently conducted' (of which *he* is the sole judge); and it gives no pecuniary aid to such schools.

'6th. It makes it *unlawful* for factory children to attend any *Wesleyan, Independent, Baptist*, or *other denominational* day-school.

'7th. It *enforces* the attendance of the children at the *church* schools, by *penalties* both on the *millowner* and *on the parents*, unless there should be a National or British school in the district, or a school within the factory.

'8th. The schools to be built and supported out of the poor's-rates are to be under the management of seven trustees; of whom the only permanent one is to be the *clergyman* of the parish,—two others are

to be *churchwardens*, chosen (when there is a greater number of churchwardens than two) *by the clergyman*,—and the remaining four to be annually appointed by the *justices* for the place or division.

'9th. The *clerical trustee* is to be the permanent chairman of the trustees,—to have a *casting vote*,—to have the *sole and exclusive* superintendence of the *religious* instruction,—to direct the master as to the religious instruction to be given,—to have the *exclusive* selection of the religious books to be used,—to *instruct, catechise*, and *examine* the children in the principles of their *religion*,—and in all this to be perfectly IRRESPONSIBLE,—the inspector of schools being expressly *forbid* even to *inquire* into the religious instruction given, to *examine* the scholars upon it, or to *make any report* thereon, unless he receive authority for that purpose from the archbishop or bishop.

'10th. The master and his assistants are to be appointed by the *bishop*.

'11th. The schools are to be *Sunday*-schools as well as day-schools; and the scholars are to attend the *established church* once every Sunday; but with the following *exceptions*—namely, that a child may be exempted from receiving *religious* instruction in the day-school, from attending the school on the Sunday, and from attending the church, if 'the parent shall *notify* to the master that, *on the ground of religious objection*, he desires such scholar *not* to attend the worship of the church of England,' or to receive *religious* instruction on week days, or to attend the church school on Sunday.

'12th. The *church catechism* and such portions of the *liturgy* as the *clergyman* may select, may be taught for *one hour*, out of three, every morning and every afternoon, except to the children whose parents shall object.

'13th. A millowner having a school within his own premises, is *obliged* to have the *church catechism* and *liturgy* taught *there* to any child being 'a member of the church of England.'—pp. 4—6.

This is a long and heavy list of charges, each one of which has already been so fully and so repeatedly insisted on, that we shall advert only to two or three which we deem most important.

The bill is compulsory, most stringently compulsory, and is enforced by a pecuniary penalty. It affects alike the child, his parent, and his employer, and enforces its requisition with a rigour which, under the circumstances of the case, is both injurious and cruel. A certificate of regular attendance at one of the schools constituted or recognised by the Act, is needful in order to a child under thirteen years of age obtaining employment, and for such attendance, a sum not exceeding threepence per week may be deducted from his wages. The education provided and thus enforced at the peril of starvation is, be it remembered, not secular only, but religious, so that we have here, as Mr. Hinton remarks, 'a new edition of the abolished Test Act, revised and enlarged. Formerly, there was a religious test for civil offices of emolument and honour; now

we have a religious test for the commonest occupations—for the factory and the forge, for the counter and the counting-house, for the plough and the sheep-fold, and our glorious condition is, that no man can work unless he has the holy mark in his forehead.'

But again, this religious education is thoroughly sectarian. About this there can be no doubt amongst reasonable men, for the thing glares upon us from every part of the bill. In the *first* place, each school is to be managed by eight trustees, of which four are permanent, the clergyman, with a second vote as chairman, two churchwardens, and the granter of the school-site. So far the sectarian element is unmitigated, for no other than a churchman, and a thorough-going one too, will give land for such a purpose. Then the other four trustees are to be elected annually by the justices at petty session, a body of men of whom it is not too much to say that fewer things will please them more than to insult and depress dissent. *Secondly*, 'the appointment, suspension, or dismissal of the master, or his assistants,' as also 'their remuneration,' are committed absolutely to this sectarian body of trustees, subject only—and let the limitation be well noted—to the approval of the bishop of the diocese '*as respects the competency of such master and his assistants to give the religious instruction required.*' *Thirdly*, the catechism and liturgy of the church—a fruitful source of the grossest and most fatal errors—are to be taught daily; and, *Fourthly*, it is provided that the master shall give 'such other religious instruction' as the *clerical* trustee shall direct; 'the mode in which such religious instruction shall be given being determined, and the selection of the books for that purpose being made, by the *clerical* trustee alone." Whether, therefore, the management, the mastership, or the instruction imparted, be considered, the sectarian character of the system is alike apparent.

It is alleged, indeed, that no violence is done to conscience in this matter, since provision is made to exempt the children of dissenters from an attendance on those instructions which are appropriate to members of the church; and we have been surprised to find some men amongst ourselves who are credulous enough to imagine that this provision of the bill will adequately meet the requirements of the case. Too honest themselves to evade the clear import of a rule whose authority they recognise, and too little disposed to suspect the sincerity of others, they fondly rely on a security whose whole object is effected when their fears are allayed, and their opposition warded off. The ground of exemption from attendance on catechetical and liturgical instruction is, *religious objection* on the part of the parent. This must be formally preferred, and what candid man can fail,

on reflection, to perceive that in the circumstances of our operatives, very few of them can be expected to hazard the consequences of such a step. The exception is perfectly nugatory; wearing, indeed, the mask of liberality, but in truth adding insult to oppression; cheating with the form of freedom only to accomplish more effectually its sinister and intolerant design. Mr. Fox has ably exposed the delusive character of this provision, and we quote his language for the information of our readers.

'Who is to decide whether an objection be '*religious*'? The Bill does not state. The case apparently comes under the plenary authority of the trustees in general, and of the clerical trustee in particular. The objections of many nonconforming and heretical classes may not be deemed religious, but irreligious. Who can regard such an occurrence as improbable, that has observed the manner in which many clergymen, and laymen under their influence, are accustomed to speak of theological opinions differing much from their own standard of orthodoxy? What follows? If the child be admitted as a pupil, and the objection disregarded as not religious, we have a barefaced system —not of compulsory education, but of compulsory proselytism. And if the child be refused admission, not only is instruction refused, but the means of subsistence also; for, by the Bill, *no factory-master can legally give that child employment.** Indeed, the dependence of the poor upon the clergy in things temporal, is yet more complete than this startling fact would indicate. A single trustee may, in the absence of the others, refuse the admission of a child, or order his expulsion.† And at every factory the law is—no school-certificate no employment. Poor families are not to be allowed to earn their bread but by clerical sufferance.

'In this state of abject dependence, the notifications will doubtless bear a small proportion to the real objections. It would have been so, independently of the new regulations; but much more under their influence. The poor, in factory districts, do not belong to the church; but the wealthy generally do, in all districts. And no disgrace commonly attaches to the exercise of that influence which station and wealth bestow, on behalf of ecclesiastical conformity. Peers are bepraised in the newspapers for clearing their estates of dissenting schools; and Chapters insert a clause of forfeiture in their leases against dissenting worship. In one direction, at least, persecution has become a recognised right of property. The notification in question will be an offensive overt act, which the poor but prudent nonconformist parent will hesitate to commit. He will often shrink from it. But the shrinking from it will not change his opinion of the church. He will not be reconciled to its doctrines or discipline; he will only be self-abased by his consciousness of cowardice. His children—for children are shrewd in their observance—will learn a fearful lesson; that of the compatibility of inward repugnance with outward sub-

* Clause 17. † Clause 54.

mission. They will be initiated, for the commencement of their moral training, into the worst corruption of modern society ; they will learn to cant for their convenience. Practically, they will be inoculated with the hypocrisy that doubts or denies, scorns or loathes, what it affects to reverence. The worth of the parent's authority is destroyed, and that of the clergyman's instructions not substituted. The framers of the Bill may contemplate no such results; but they cannot preclude them, unless the measure be largely modified.

'Suppose the notification made, and the child admitted. The Bill then declares, that 'it shall not be lawful for any person to compel such child to be present' at the periods of liturgical instruction, 'not to punish, or otherwise molest, such child for not being present.' Gracious words ; but where and what is the definition or the penalty of molestation ? The school may be easily made too hot to hold the child, without any tangible violation of the law. And is there not plenty of molestation according to the law ? It is a molestation that his religion is formally proscribed and prohibited.* The master's comments, or exposition, when he reads the Holy Scriptures to all the children† every day, may be a molestation. There may be plenty of hitting at him, and his parents, and his creed, and his scruples, and his sect, which all will perceive, and he will feel. The very selection of chapters, were they read without comment, might, by a zealous master, be made a molestation. The boy may be pelted with texts ; and texts pelt as hard as paving-stones. The school-books may be full of molestation. Bigotry and intolerance may be evinced in teaching how to spell or to count. Elementary works have been, and perhaps still are, used in 'national schools,' by which this assertion is fully sustained. The daily division of the school, by the test of conformity, is a molestation. The clerical trustee, or his deputy, comes in like a little deity to judgment, and the young sheep are placed at his right, the juvenile goats sent to the left about, and every infant amongst them made to feel, not only the bitterness of sectarian separation, but the dignity of conformity and the degradation of dissent.'—pp. 9—12.

The schools constituted under this act are to be supported partly from the poor's-rates—the rate-payers having, however, no control over them—partly from fees deducted from the wages of the children—partly by voluntary donations, and partly, under certain conditions, by loans of public money. The great stress of the burden will obviously fall on the poor's-rates, which will in consequence become essentially an ecclesiastical assessment, and be liable to the same objections as are preferred against the church-rate. We need not insist at large on this objection, as it was urged by Sir Robert Peel himself on the 12th of February, 1839. It is true he was then in Opposition, and new light has since broken in, but his words are on record, and we adduce them in justification of the ground we take.

* Clause 59. † Clause 57.

'I shall offer (said Sir Robert Peel) the most strenuous opposition in my power to any plan that violates *perfect liberty of education.* I think the noble lord (Lord John Russell) *must not attempt to introduce the system of compulsory assessment into parishes.* Where the dissenters form a great minority, and the rest of the inhabitants of the parish are members of the established church, *I cannot believe* that the principle of compulsory assessment will give satisfaction to the dissenters, or *that they will submit* in cases where the members of the church preponderate in the vestry, to a tax imposed by them for the support of schools. I hope the noble lord will take care *that he does not expose the poor law to unpopularity* on account of any unnecessary interference with education. I, for one, am deeply convinced of the absolute necessity, and of the moral obligation of providing for the education of the people, but *I am, at the same time, perfectly convinced that this can only be done in this country,* where so much religious dissent prevails, *by leaving it to the voluntary exertions of the parties themselves,* and by permitting each to educate his children, as he at present is at liberty to do, in those great principles of faith in which they were born. I cannot help expressing my confident belief that the church of England is now awakened to the absolute necessity, not by force, not by compulsion, *not by interfering, in the slightest degree, with the principles of religious freedom,* but awakened to the absolute necessity of assuming that position which she ought to assume, in constant and cordial co-operation with the landed proprietors and others of the country; and that *the only satisfactory way of having a system of education (which ought to be founded upon the basis of religion) in this country, is for each party to act for themselves, imposing no restriction upon others.*'

Plain men, of unsophisticated judgments, will greatly wonder how the opposition leader, who uttered such sentiments as these in 1839, could in 1843 give the sanction of an administration, of which he was the head, to such a measure as we have been considering.

On the whole, then—for we must bring our remarks to a close—we protest against the bill, the whole bill, and call for its entire abandonment. It admits of no modifications, but must be rejected altogether. Lord John Russell's resolutions are in many respects as objectionable as the bill itself. They concede to the church all which it *professedly* aims at, but stop short of the gratuitous insults and wrongs which the bill inflicts. We therefore place them at once out of account, and call upon dissenters not to permit their attention to be distracted by them. The real scheme is other than what appears, and it is therefore idle to talk about the evils of ignorance, and the necessity for education, when the object sought is a *preparatory ecclesiastical establishment,* a sort of Church of England Junior. The question at issue, the matter really in debate, is this, and none other, and dissenters

should look it fairly in the face, and take their ground accordingly. It is a church-extension scheme which the government has propounded—a scheme as unscriptural in its tendencies as delusive in its professions, as ruinous to all which is energetic and vital in religious instruction, as it would be found conducive to the propagation of error and the ruin of the souls of men.

Brief Notices.

Baxter's Portrait of the Missionaries, Williams and Moffat.

A critique on works of art is somewhat out of our sphere, yet we cannot, in the present instance, withhold our high commendation of the finished beauty and self-speaking character of the two portraits before us. Such men as Williams and Moffat, are the property of the church universal, and thousands who bear not their name, will rejoice to have these all but speaking likenesses of their noble countenances. The portrait of Moffat is placed on the foreground of an interesting African scene; and in his rear is given a view of a Bechuana parliament, with a chief speaking, in their midst, of the arrival of the Christian teacher; while that of the lamented Martyr of Erromanga represents him as seated in his study, occupied in transcribing the 'Missionary Enterprise.' Of the accuracy of the likenesses there can be no doubt. Those who have once looked upon the countenance of either will instantly recognise it; and the spirit of the portraits is equal to their fidelity. The success of Mr. Baxter's process is clearly established by the force and character, combined with great softness and delicacy, which distinguish these productions of his skill.

A Diamond Latin-English Dictionary; being an Abridgment of The Young Scholar's Latin-English Dictionary. By the Rev. J. E. Riddle, M.A. London: Longman and Co.

We have on former occasions expressed our high opinion of the value of Mr. Riddle's Latin Dictionary, and need, therefore, do nothing more, at present, than give the following extract from his preface to the neat little pocket volume now before us. 'This Dictionary is designed chiefly as a guide to the meaning and quality of classical Latin words. It offers information necessary for persons who, with greater or less knowledge of the Latin language, may need assistance in ascertaining the force or bearing of a sentence, and it may, perhaps, be found useful as a companion in travelling, or in other cases in which a larger volume would be burdensome or inconvenient. In substance, it is an abridgment of my 'Young Scholar's Latin-English Dictionary' in square duodecimo, and the more 'Complete Dictionary' in octavo.'

Brief Memorials of Departed Saints. By the Rev. J. M. Chapman. *With a Brief Memoir of the Author,* by the Rev. J. Baynes; *and Preface,* by the Rev. J. Campbell, D.D. London: Dyer. 1842.

The substance of this volume was prepared by the lamented author for publication just previously to his death. His sudden removal has now added the brief memorial of his own life to those of others already compiled by him. They are abridgments of some of those contained in Brooks' 'Lives of the Puritans,' and Burnham's Memorials, with others added from various sources of later date. They are judiciously selected, and arranged with convenience for occasional reading. As a compilation of interesting religious biography the volume is worthy of a place in the cabinet of every devout Christian. Moral and spiritual excellence is cherished by association with the good, and communion with renewed minds, and from the perusal of these 'Memorials of Departed Saints' some may be led to imitate their virtues and to join their company hereafter. We shall be very glad if the sale of this volume tends in any measure to encourage the hearts and relieve the anxieties of the widow and fatherless. To not a few of those who loved and esteemed Mr. Chapman, the most interesting portion of the book will be its appendages. They consist of a memoir of the excellent compiler, which is in itself an interesting specimen of Christian biography, and an affectionate tribute of fraternal regard; an earnest recommendatory preface, by Dr. Campbell; the concluding portion of a sermon by the Rev. W. Robinson, curate of Yeovil, whose sentiments and actions display a genuine catholicity of Christian feeling, which it is delightful to observe; and the last sermon preached by Mr. Chapman himself.

Eminent Holiness essential to an Efficient Ministry. By the Rev. Octavius Winslow. London: Houlston and Stoneman.

We have perused this little volume with satisfaction and thankfulness to God and its author for the powerful and faithful manner in which its subject is treated. The future stability and success of the church of Christ, and with these the brightest hope that can be entertained of the amelioration and increased happiness of man can only be realized, under a gracious Providence, by the spirituality and power of the religious teacher of this and the succeeding age. The earnest student of biblical or theological literature is exposed, in the task that he pursues, to peculiar dangers, and is liable to mistake professional zeal for increased holiness. Mr. Winslow's sermon is adapted to prevent such fearful error, and to set forth, in language worthy of his subject, the responsibility and dangers of the Christian ministry. We could have wished that the text selected as the basis of the discourse had been, in its original application, more clearly in unison with the subject. The substance of these pages was delivered as an address at the opening session of Stepney College. We advise all students for the ministry, and young ministers, to give it an attentive perusal.

Expository Lectures on the First Four Chapters of the Gospel according to St. Matthew, &c. By the Rev. W. Blackley, A.B., Chaplain to Sir R. Hill, Bart., M.P. 1842. London: Hatchard and Son.

The Voice of Christ to the Churches, considered in a Course of Twenty-one Lectures, Expository and Practical, on the Second and Third Chapters of the Book of the Revelation. By Ebenezer Miller, A.M. London: Jackson and Walford.

Expository preaching is the most Scriptural, the most profitable, and in the end the most pleasing form of communicating religious truth. We rejoice in the hope that Christian congregations generally are beginning to apprehend its usefulness, and Christian ministers more carefully and frequently to practise it. Both the above works are expositions of parts of Scripture, and are creditable to the minds and hearts of their authors. The former were delivered in a large schoolroom, among a rural population; the latter to a church assembling at Rotterdam. They are valuable, interesting, and faithful illustrations of the truths of the word of God.

A Pastor's Memorial to his former Flock; consisting of Sermons and Addresses, the relics of a by-gone Ministry. By John Macdonald, A.M., a Missionary Minister of the Church of Scotland in India, and formerly Pastor of the Scotch Church, River Terrace, Islington. 1842. London: Cotes, Cheapside.

An interesting and affecting volume, full of the simple truths and the benevolent spirit of the gospel. The author left England for Calcutta as a Missionary of the church of Scotland in India, in 1837, and these fragments of his past labours have been compiled and prepared by him in a foreign land, and dedicated, with much affectionate earnestness, to his former charge. The sermons and addresses are principally on subjects connected with the missionary enterprise.

Pleasant Memories of Pleasant Lands; being Poetical Records of a Visit to the Classic Spots and most Eminent Persons in England, Scotland, and France. By Mrs. L. H. Sigourney. London: Allman. 1843.

A little book full of benevolence and poetry. The author appears to have visited Europe, especially our own country, not to observe and publish defects, but excellencies. With reference to the responsibility resting on the traveller in publishing the knowledge which he has obtained of foreign countries, she wisely remarks in her preface—'It would seem that an obligation was laid on him not to use the knowledge thus acquired, to embarrass and embroil God's creatures, but to brighten the bands of the nation with a wreath of love.' A beautiful wreath has Mrs. Sigourney woven. We trust that it may serve to strengthen as well as embellish the bands that unite two kindred nations. One flower we will gather, not perhaps because it is the most beautiful,

for there are others equally fair, but because it is easily transferable to our pages. It is inscribed as a sonnet

TO SOUTHEY.

'I thought to see thee in thy lake-girt home,
Thou of creative soul! I thought with thee
Amid thy mountain solitudes to roam,
And hear the voice, whose echoes, wild and free,
Had strangely thrill'd me, when my life was new,
With old romantic tales of wondrous lore.
But ah! they told me that thy mind withdrew
Into its mystic cell—nor evermore
Sat on the lip, in fond familiar word,
Nor through the speaking eye her love repaid
Whose heart for thee with ceaseless care is stirr'd,
Both night and day; upon the willow shade
Her sweet harp hung! They told me, and I wept,
As on my pilgrim's way o'er England's vales I kept.'

August 28, 1840.

There is many a friendly tribute to English virtue and kindness, and many an affecting incident of travel told in the pleasing numbers of song. The price of this edition places the charming little volume within reach of a large class of readers.

History of the Reformation in the Sixteenth Century. By J. H. Merle D'Aubigné. *Translated by* David Dundas Scott, Esq. *With Notes from the Netherlands Edition of the Rev. J. J. Le Roy, of the Dutch Reformed Church. Illustrated with Portraits.* Vol. II. Parts 13—24. Glasgow: Blackie and Son.

In reviewing some months ago (June, 1842) the several rival translations of M. D'Aubigné's great work, we had occasion to criticise the merits of the first volume of Mr. Scott's version, and we may content ourselves, therefore, with referring the reader to the judgment there expressed. That article, it may be recollected, was principally occupied with the *third* volume of M. D'Aubigné's work, and with the translation of it which had appeared from the pen of the *first* English translator. Mr. Scott's translation had then only proceeded to the end of *his* first volume, which included about one and a half of the French edition. He has now completed his second volume, which brings up the work to the end of M. D'Aubigné's third volume, the last yet published. The publishers intimate 'that the author's fourth volume is expected shortly to appear,' and 'that when obtained, its translation will be promptly proceeded with by Mr. Scott.' In the above-mentioned article on M. D'Aubigné, we remarked that Mr. Scott's edition was distinguished by two attractive features, which gave it some advantage over its rivals. One is, that it incorporates the notes of the Netherlands Edition of J. J. Le Roy; the other, that it is illustrated by a series of well-engraved portraits of the principal personages who

figured in the scenes of the history it describes. The portraits already given, are those of Luther, Leo X., Œcolampadius, Erasmus, Charles V., Zwingle, Melancthon, Tetzel, Calvin, Margaret of Valois, The Elector Frederick, and Spalatin. We can only repeat the wish that *all* the translations of this most important work (which was never more needed than at the present crisis) may meet with a sale which may 'repay the industry and justify the outlay of the respective authors and publishers,' though still retaining our formerly expressed opinion 'of the inexpediency of publishing so many translations of the same work.'

A Dictionary, Geographical, Statistical, and Historical, of the various Countries, Places, and Principal Natural Objects, in the World. By J. R. M'Culloch, Esq. Parts I. II. III. London: Longman and Co.

This is one of that series of valuable encyclopædias, published by Messrs. Longman and Co., to one of which we recently called the attention of our readers in an article of some length. We presume that the present work is now completed; we have, however, seen only the first three parts, and can therefore speak only of them; when we have had an opportunity of inspecting the rest, we shall be in a condition to speak of the work at greater length.

The name of Mr. M'Culloch, the laborious editor of the valuable 'Dictionary of Commerce,' is sufficient guarantee that no labour or pains have been spared to ensure accuracy. In the articles which we have examined, we have observed no error of any importance, with a single exception. The type, while clear, is small, thus furnishing a very large amount of matter in a small compass. Great compression has also been employed in the preparation of the articles.

Elements of Geometry: consisting of the first four and the sixth Books of Euclid, chiefly from the text of Dr. Robert Simson, with the Principal Theorems in proportion, and a Course of practical Geometry on the Ground. Also Four Tracts relating to Circles, Planes, and Solids, with one on Spherical Geometry. For the use of the Royal Military College. By John Narrien, F.R.S., and R.A.S., Professor of Mathematics, &c., in the Institution. 8vo. London: Longman and Co. 1842. pp. 276.

Though primarily designed 'for the use of the Royal Military College,' we are much mistaken if this work will not have a very considerable circulation beyond it, especially when the whole series of works (of which it is, in fact, only a portion, and which, when finished, will furnish a complete course of mathematics) shall be published. Such a course, formed on one plan, of moderate compass, and moderate price, was much needed, and will be most acceptable to very many mathematical students. The 'present treatise' on the Elements of Geometry, forms, we are told in the advertisement, 'the *second* of a

series which is to constitute a general course of mathematics for the use of the gentlemen cadets and the officers in the senior department' of the above-mentioned Institution. Whether this means that this treatise is to form the *second* of the series, when completed, although the *first* is not yet published, or that one has already appeared before this, we know not. We presume the former supposition is the true one, as we have seen no portion of the course except the present treatise. The course, when completed, will comprehend the subjects whose titles are subjoined:—I. Arithmetic and Algebra. II. Geometry. III. Plane and Spherical Trigonometry, with Mensuration. IV. Analytical Geometry and the Differential and Integral Calculus, with the properties of the Conic Sections. V. Practical Astronomy and Geodesy. VI. The Principles of Mechanics. VII. Physical Astronomy.

On most of these subjects there are, no doubt, many admirable works already before the public. But the best are far too voluminous and expensive, while many others are either too slight or too profound for the generality of students. But independently of this, we think the advantage is not inconsiderable, of studying these subjects in a systematic course, expounded in a series of works projected and executed under the eye of a single editor. No one who has studied such a *series* (as, for example, Mr. De Morgan's excellent series of works) can be insensible of the advantage of easy reference to what has been already proved, and of familiarity with the author's arrangement, method, and even *style*, (for mathematics has its better and worse *styles*, as well as any other department of literature.)—The present treatise is an excellent commencement of the undertaking. The title page will show how comprehensive is the ' geometry' it teaches. We are happy to find that the principal propositions of Euclid's fifth book (for which Mr. Ivory's ' Tract on Proportion' has been substituted) are given (and with great clearness) in the theorems on proportion, and *geometrically* proved. This is as it should be. An algebraical investigation of these theorems is also appended. The course of practical geometry on the ground, and the portions on solid and spherical geometry, will also, we feel convinced, be regarded as valuable improvements on the ordinary editions of Euclid. We have only to say that the type is clear, the diagrams well executed, and the whole *getting up* admirable.

We shall be curious to see the remaining portions of the projected course, and shall be most happy to be enabled to speak in terms of similar commendation of them, as of this treatise on Geometry. Nothing is more needed than a treatise, neither too full nor too scanty, —elementary enough, but not too elementary,—on analytical geometry and the differential and integral calculus. We could mention many admirable works—as, for example, Mr. Waud's treatise on the former subject, and Mr. De Morgan's elaborate work on the latter, (both published in the Library of Useful Knowledge,) but they are too voluminous and profound for the general student, who can read them to full advantage only after some more limited treatises. Similar observations apply to many other valuable works on these subjects.

Family Essays on the Creation, Preservation, and Government of the Universe, intended for the Evening of every Sunday throughout the Year. Each Essay followed by an appropriate Prayer. Edinburgh: William Whyte. 1842.

A Manual of Devotion for Individuals; or, Selection of Scripture Readings, Hymns, and Prayers, for the Mornings and Evenings of Four Weeks, with Hymns and Prayers for various Occasions. By an Octogenarian. London: Jackson and Walford. 1842.

The first of these publications is a singular combination of religious truth, with the discoveries of science and the facts of history. It is a thick octavo of four hundred pages, printed on good paper and in large type. The essays in it are twenty-six in number. 'The second part will be brought forward as soon as possible, and it is purposed that the whole work shall afterwards be completed by the addition of essays of half the length, for the evenings of the week-days, upon the philosophical and historical subjects alluded to on the foregoing Sunday.' We fear that the essays are too much in the form of philosophical treatises to be popular, and of too superficial a kind to secure the attention of those who have thought of the subjects of which they treat. 'The instilling of truth in an interesting form into the minds of the uninstructed,' which the author proposes as the object of his labours, is a task that requires great simplicity and freshness of manner, as well as an accurate and comprehensive knowledge of the truth to be communicated. The author, who enters at some length into the controverted topics of geology, interprets the six days of creation as indefinite periods of time; and, as far as we can understand his meaning, supposes that we are even now living during the seventh. The object is undoubtedly commendable, but there is much want of adaptation in the manner by which it is sought to be accomplished.

The second publication is sufficiently described by its title, and is likely to be very useful to those for whom it is intended.

Pocahontas, and other Poems.

Poems, Religious and Elegiac. By Mrs. L. N. Sigourney. London: Robert Tyas.

The name of Mrs. Sigourney is well known to most of our readers, as a writer both of prose and of poetry; and the two neat volumes before us, forming a general collection of her poetical works, will, we doubt not, be welcome to her numerous admirers. The prevailing characteristics of this lady's poetry are, great delicacy of feeling, graceful diction, and a sweet and easy flow of versification, which, among the general class of readers, goes farther than any other qualification. Most of Mrs. Sigourney's poems are short. In 'Pocahontas,' however, she has attempted one of some length, and has adopted a verse resembling the difficult, but beautiful Spenserian stanza. Although, as a whole,

it seems unfinished, there are detached passages of great spirit; her *forte*, however, lies rather in shorter compositions.

The 'Thoughts at Sea,' with anticipations of 'England, motherland,' of her 'bards of old,' of her memories of other days, her 'old kings and steel-clad knights,' her castles, her cathedrals, are very characteristic; and her enthusiastic address to Wordsworth is as honourable to herself as it must have been gratifying to the poet.

As a writer of religious poetry, Mrs. Sigourney deserves much praise. There is a condensation in some of her lines which contrasts favourably with the wire-drawn style too much adopted by writers on religious subjects, and which may frequently, we think, be traced to the injurious facility with which verses are composed in those popular metres that are mostly used for the purpose. We would recommend especially to Mrs. Sigourney's attention, the longer and more difficult measures of English poetry; not because they are difficult, but because great care and polish, and nice choice of diction, are required in their construction, and in the very labour of composition a condensation is obtained, which is one of the most important requisites, (although in the present day well nigh overlooked) of genuine poetry. We have been struck with this in looking over these two volumes; for while several of the pieces written in the more popular measures are, though flowing and graceful, by far too diffuse, those where the construction of the verse required more care are often characterized, not merely by greater precision, but by far greater force and spirit.

A Memoir of Ebenezer Birrell, late of Stepney College, London. By his Brother. Second Edition. London: Simpkin and Marshall.

An affectionate tribute to the memory of a deceased brother, written in an admirable spirit, and evidently intended rather to benefit the living than to eulogize the dead. To young men in general, and to ministerial students in particular, it will prove both a pleasing and a useful companion.

The Fall of Man; The Atonement; Divine Influence—Three Lectures recently delivered in Holloway Chapel. By A. J. Morris. London: Jackson and Walford.

These lectures are no ordinary productions, whether regarded as indications of the mental character of their author, or as pulpit expositions of three of the most important doctrines of the divine word. The views taken, as well as the mode in which they are exhibited, are eminently adapted to command the respectful attention, and to minister to the religious improvement of an intelligent people. We congratulate the church at Holloway in having obtained such a pastor, and trust they will prove themselves worthy of the boon, by esteeming him very highly in love for his work's sake. Were our pulpit ministrations generally of the character of these discourses, we should soon perceive a vast improvement in the taste and religious attainments of the people.

The Nursery Rhymes of England, obtained principally from Oral Tradition. Collected and edited by James Orchard Halliwell, Esq. Second Edition. *With Alterations and Additions.* London: John Russell Smith.

The first edition of this work was printed in 1841 for private circulation amongst the members of the *Percy Society*, but a demand for it having arisen on the part of the public, it is now reprinted in an enlarged and improved form. 'It has been the editor's principal object to form as genuine a collection of the old vernacular rhymes of the English nursery as he possibly could, without admitting any very modern compositions, at least none belonging to the present century.' In this object Mr. Halliwell has most happily succeeded, and the result is a volume equally acceptable to the youngest of our children, and to the antiquarian investigator of our literature. Many of the rhymes included in the collection are evidently fragments of old ballads, and thus possess a value apart from their nursery associations. We envy not the sensibility or the intelligence of the man who can throw aside such a volume as too trifling for his inspection, or read it with other feelings than those of deep interest. We confess for ourselves—however incompatible it may be deemed with our grave vocation—that it has renewed with a vividness rarely obtained, some of the earliest and most fondly cherished of our impressions.

Illustrations of Scripture from the Geography, Natural History, and Manners and Customs of the East. By the late Professor George Paxton, D.D. Third Edition. Revised and greatly enlarged. By the Rev. Robert Jamieson—*Geography.* Edinburgh: Oliphant and Son.

This volume completes a very neat, cheap, and greatly improved edition of Professor Paxton's *Illustrations of Scripture.* The edition consists of four volumes, which may be had separately or together. The first volume is devoted to the *Geography*, the second to the *Natural History*, and the third and fourth to the *Manners and Customs* of the East, and the whole bear the marks of a sound and discriminating judgment, habits of accurate and extensive research, together with an enlightened appreciation of the studies pursued. The work passed through two editions during the life of the author, and is now re-issued, with very considerable additions, under the editorship of the Rev. Robert Jamieson. 'The contributions of the editor, in all the three departments of the work, have been considerable; having for many years been a gleaner in this captivating field of study, he has been enabled to introduce all the most important observations and researches that have been communicated to the world, either in books of travels or the transactions of literary societies for the last twenty years, and has thus imparted to the new issue a rich variety and copiousness of illustration, that must render it greatly superior in value and interest to the former editions.' A brief Memoir of the author, by the Rev. Dr. Mitchell, is also prefixed to this edition, and copious indexes, both of *subjects* and of *Scripture passages*, are supplied.

Literary Intelligence.

In the Press.

Letters on Puritanism and Nonconformity. By Sir John Bickerton Williams, Knt., LL.D., F.S.A. In one volume, foolscap 8vo.

A Translation of Professor Vinet's Essay on the Profession of Personal Religious Conviction, and upon the Separation of Church and State, considered with reference to the fulfilment of that duty. By Charles Theodore Jones. In one volume, royal 12mo.

A Third Edition of Dr. Pye Smith's Scripture and Geology is now ready. In one volume, foolscap 8vo.

A Memoir of the late Greville Ewing, Minister of the Gospel, Glasgow. By his Daughter. One vol. 8vo, with a Portrait.

Astronomy and Scripture, or Illustrations of Holy Writ in connexion with that Science. By Rev. Thomas Milner, M.A. One vol. foolscap.

The Third and Cheap Edition of the Martyr of Erromanga ; or the Philosophy of Missions illustrated from the Life &c. of Rev. John Williams. By Rev. John Campbell, D.D.

Second Edition of Letters on Missions. By Rev. W. Swan.

Letters written during a Journey to Switzerland in the Autumn of 1841. By Mrs. Ashton Yates.

Just Published.

Memoirs and Correspondence of Francis Horner, M.P. Edited by his brother, Leonard Horner, Esq., F.R.S. 2 vols.

The Life of a Travelling Physician, including Twenty Years' Wanderings through the greater part of Europe. 3 vols.

The Works of William Jay, collected and revised by Himself. Vol. VI. The Christian Contemplated.

The Fallacies of Faculty, with the Principles of the Chrono-Thermal System of Medicine. By Samuel Dickson, M.D. People's Edition.

The Emigrant's Hand-Book of Facts concerning Canada, New Zealand, Australia, Cape of Good Hope, &c. By Samuel Butler.

Address to Agriculturists and Others, on the Nature and Effects of the present Corn Laws, as bearing on their Interests. By Dr. Henry Edwards.

Frederick the Great, his Court and Times. Edited by Thomas Campbell, Esq. Vols. III. and IV.

The Scenery and Antiquities of Ireland Illustrated. Part XXII.

The Pictorial Edition of Shakspere—William Shakspere. A Biography. Part VI.

Fox's Book of Martyrs. Edited by Rev. J. Cumming, M.A. Part XXI.

Popular Cyclopædia of Natural Science, Mechanical Science, and its application to the Arts. By W. B. Carpenter, M.D.

Letter to Lord Ashley, M.P., on the Present Defective State of National Education, and the Necessity of Government Interference. By Rev. Thos. Page, M.A.

Extracts, Useful, Instructive, and Entertaining.

The Voice of the Anglican Church ; being the Declared Opinions of her Bishops on the Doctrines of the Oxford Tract Writers. With an Introductory Essay. By Rev. Henry Hughes, M.A.

Pleasant Memorials of Pleasant Lands. By Mrs. L. H. Sigourney.

Life in Mexico, during a Residence of Two Years in that Country. By Madame C—— de la B——. With a Preface. By W. H. Prescott.

The Wives of England, their Relative Duties, Domestic Influence, and Social Obligations. By the Author of 'The Women of England.'

Sermons, printed from the MSS. of the late Rev. Benjamin Beddome. With a brief Memoir of the Author.

The Papal and Hierarchical System compared with the Religion of the New Testament. 12mo.

The Works of Thomas Chalmers, D.D. and LL.D. Vols. XXII—XXV. Lectures on the Epistle to the Romans.

Lectures on the Headship of Christ as embodied in the Constitution, and illustrated in the History of the Church of Scotland. By Ministers of the Established Church of Scotland.

A Course of Lectures to Young Men, on Science, Literature, and Religion, delivered in Glasgow by Ministers of various Denominations. Second Series.

Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology. Edited by William Smith, LL.D., Ph. D. Part II.

The Gospel promotive of True Happiness. By the Rev. Hugh White, A.M., Dublin.

Anglo-Catholicism not Apostolical; being an Inquiry into the Scriptural Authority of the leading doctrines advocated in the Tracts for the Times, &c. By William Lindsay Alexander, M.A.

On the Old and New Covenants. By David Russell, D.D., Dundee. Second Edition.

The Christian's Daily Companion. A Series of Practical Meditations, or Short Practical Discourses for every Morning and Evening throughout the year. By Clergymen of the Church of Scotland. Parts VII., VIII., IX., and X.

Fox's Book of Martyrs. Edited by Rev. John Cumming, M.A. Part XXII.

China, in a Series of Views displaying Scenery, Architecture, Social Habits, &c. By Thomas Allom. With Historical and Descriptive Notices by Rev. G. N. Wright. Parts V. and VI.

The Scenery and Antiquities of Ireland illustrated. Part XXIII.

A Diamond Latin-English Dictionary. By Rev. J. E. Riddle, M.A.

Tintern, Stonehenge—'Oh think of me at times.' By Stephen Prentis, M.A. of Christ's College, Cambridge.

Bibliotheca Sacra; or Tracts and Essays on Topics connected with Biblical Literature and Theology. No. I. Editor, Edward Robinson, D.D., New York.

An Exposure, from Personal Observation, of Female Prostitution in London, Leeds, and Rochdale, and especially in the City of Glasgow, with Remarks on the Cause, Extent, Results, and Remedy of the Evil. By William Logan. Second Edition, enlarged.

Methodism in its Origin, Economy, and Present Position. A Sermon in Three Parts, preached before the Wesleyan Methodist Conference, 1842, and published by their order. By Rev. James Dixon, Ex-President.

Annotations on the Pentateuch, the Psalms, and the Song of Solomon. By Henry Ainsworth. 2 vols.

The Holy Bible, accompanied throughout by a brief Hermeneutic and Exegetical Commentary and Revised Version. By Rev. T. J. Hussey, D.D. Part II.

The Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature. By John Kitto. Part I.

The Principles and Constitution of the Church of Christ as delineated in the Holy Scriptures. By Rev. H. W. Williams.

Gathered Leaves. By James A. Page, Under-graduate of Trinity College, Dublin.

Outlines for the Pulpit, or Short Illustrations of Select Texts for Evangelical Discourses. By Adam Thomson, D.D.

A Sketch of Popery.

Electricity, its Phenomena, Laws, and Results.

Dominici Diodati I. C. Neapolitani de Christo Græce Loquente Exercitatio. Edited, with a Preface, by Orlando T. Dobbin, LL.B.

THE

ECLECTIC REVIEW

For JUNE, 1843.

Art. I. *Essai sur la Manifestation des Convictions Religieuses et sur la Separation de l'Eglise et de l'Etat, envisagee comme consequence nécessaire et comme garantie du principe.* Par A. Vinet. Paris. 1842. 8vo. pp. 552.

Manifold and most significant are the symptoms that the great question of 'Church and State' will speedily become *the* question of our times, not only in our own country, but on the continent. It is, in fact, fast becoming European. At home, it is not only discussed with increasing interest, and a deeper conviction of its importance, amongst the large and influential communities which have separated from the establishment, but circumstances of a most singular character have, to a greater or less extent, simultaneously forced its consideration on members both of the Scotch and English churches, and have led to declarations of the most novel and astounding character; while the copious and highly philosophical work of Monsieur Vinet (from which we propose to translate some striking and powerful passages in the course of the present article), show that on the continent also the question is beginning to be agitated with the same interest which attaches to it amongst ourselves; with the earnestness, in fact, which is fairly due to its tremendous magnitude and momentous consequences.

Our own views on the subject of 'Church and State' have often been propounded to our readers, and will often be propounded again. It is not our purpose, however, to insist on them on the present occasion. It will be equally interesting to see the light in which our countrymen, professed advocates of the church-and-state system, begin to view the subject, and to mark the highly significant declarations which unexpected

changes of position, and 'untoward circumstances' have extorted from them. Before proceeding, therefore, to an analysis of the work of Monsieur Vinet, we propose to dwell for a page or two on this topic.

Half developed as may be the views of many members of the English and Scotch establishments, who yet have proclaimed their discontent at the actual relations which subsist between the church and the state,—tenaciously as they may cling to the preferments and emoluments they cannot prevail upon themselves to sacrifice,—and long as they may hope that the evils of which they complain may admit of remedy, we feel convinced that their very restlessness and murmurs will do more, in the first instance, to subdue prejudices in their own minds and in those of their fellow members, than the strongest and clearest argumentation from the pen of a dissenter. Imperfectly developed, inconsistent, ambiguous as their sentiments and declarations may be, they are gradually familiarizing the minds of churchmen to the contemplation of the dreaded question, and are inducing them to ask whether there may not be, whether there is not more than a counterbalance of evils to set off against the fancied advantages of the state alliance; to ask what, after all, would be the terrible consequences of a dissolution of that alliance. This alone, we consider no trivial point gained. The great difficulty has been to get the churchman seriously to entertain the question. Till lately, he held his opinions as a sort of axioms which were not to be disputed, and would almost as soon listen to an infidel attempting to disprove the truth of Christianity, as to any one who should endeavour to show that state alliance and state patronage were prejudicial to its progress and influence. But circumstances have, in thousands of cases, not a little shaken the integrity and firmness of this belief. Changes the most sudden and unlooked for, events of the most singular and intractable character, have revealed more than was ever suspected before, of the perils and difficulties which attend the anomalous alliance of church and state. They have shown that it is not all sunshine—that all the advantage is not on the side of the church—that if endowed and protected, she must pay something for her privileges, and amongst other things, pawn to the state the brightest jewel in her diadem,—the spiritual supremacy, the noble independence with which her divine Lord had invested her. It has been found that the state does not give, but lend, and that on most usurious interest; that if the church accept of the state benefactions, she is expected to repay them by servile and degrading dependence, and must submit to have her hands tied, her tongue schooled, and her freedom of action and of movement fettered. This both epis-

copalians and presbyterians have been painfully taught by the experience of the past few years. Nothing, it is true, can be more unreasonable than their complaints; for it is perfectly fair, that so long as they persist in remaining in an established church, they should submit with patience to the conditions on which that establishment has been constituted; that they should scrupulously maintain the bargain into which they have voluntarily entered, as much when they are on the losing, as when they are on the winning side; that as reciprocity is the avowed basis of the contract, they should not pretend that it is their exclusive province to receive, but not to give; to enjoy privileges and endowments, and yet remain uncontrolled; to be both dependent and independent at the same time. But though their complaints, considering their position, are most inconsistent and irrational, it is pleasant to find them uttered. They indicate life, at all events. Indeed, though the system of a state church may work with tolerable smoothness in periods of religious languor or drowsiness, which, in fact, it has a constant tendency to produce or to perpetuate, the reviviscence and general diffusion of religious feeling (even though it be of a morbid character) never fails to reveal more or less of the anomalous conditions on which the alliance depends, and the practical difficulties and perplexities which ever attend it; to awaken in the minds of Christians a deep and burning sense of the degradation in which the church is involved, the humbling vassalage to which she is reduced. Nor are the complaints of our inconsistent churchmen, whether episcopalians or presbyterians, significant on this ground only. As already said, they cannot but tend to shake the confidence and abate the prejudices of the bigoted adherents of the system, and to familiarize their minds to the contemplation of a subject which has had to contend with no obstacle so great as the obstinacy which refuses honestly to investigate it.

Believing that nothing can be effected in questions of so momentous a character except by prolonged public discussion, we are persuaded that Divine providence has done more by forcing this subject on the understanding and consciences of churchmen themselves, than would have been effected by the most cogent argumentation of dissenters. Let us briefly consider the indications which present themselves, as to the present position of the great question, both in the north and the south of our island.

If we look to Scotland, we see the establishment in the most extraordinary condition. Without entering into the question of the motives or conduct, the consistency or otherwise, of those who have originated the late movement; without inquiring whether the secular interference against which they protest be denounced on precisely the right ground, or whether theirnotions

of the spiritual independence which belongs to Christ's church be not somewhat imperfect, it is a *fact* that the difficulties of maintaining the alliance with anything approaching a due regard to the claims of the church as a spiritual institute, has forced on thousands of minds *all but* a conviction that those difficulties are insuperable, and on thousands more a *thorough* conviction that the dissolution of all connexion with the state would be an evil of very little consequence compared with the usurpation of the rights and privileges of Christ's church. Speeches and declarations to this effect are now quite familiar to the ears of the people. We see, in fact, no inconsiderable portion of the Scottish church apparently on the very point of detaching itself from that community, (whether indeed, they ought not, in consistency, to have taken such a step before this, may well admit of question,) and regularly and coolly organizing a plan of government and economics previous to their departure. This separation it seems now almost impossible to avert, without either some extraordinary fetch of policy on the part of the state, which will compromise its claims, or some equally extraordinary concession on the part of the dissentients, which will compromise still more fatally their honour and their conscience. Nor is it among the least significant indications of the times, that the most distinguished leader of the non-intrusion party is precisely the man who, some six years ago, was summoned to London, to champion, by his eloquence, the cause of establishments against all opposers. And this very man —strange fatality!—is now, and has long been, all but a dissenter!

But we need say the less on the subject of the Scotch church, as its present position was so fully discussed only a short time since in the pages of this journal; and what was then said is doubtless still fresh in the recollection of our readers.

Equally instructive are the admissions and complaints uttered by the Puseyite faction. None can view with greater apprehension, amazement, or disgust, the system of error and superstition which they are so busy in propagating, or be more alive to the dangerous tendency of the principles they advocate than ourselves. Yet these very errors have forced them on a partial recognition of one important truth—the degraded position of their church arising out of her present relations to the state. Their very excess of superstitious reverence, their very admiration of that paramount church-authority which they would fain revive, compels them to regard the church as crippled and shackled hand and foot, and has led them repeatedly to speak in no very measured terms of the evils which flow from the once vaunted 'alliance.' Though, if made absolutely independent of the state to-morrow, they would probably attempt to realize a system which

we should altogether deplore; though they would probably make a desperate attempt at reunion with the Romish church; though they would, perhaps, wish, not only to see the church released from the thraldom of the state, but with *their* exaggerated views of her supremacy, to see the state entirely subordinated to *her*,—still they are, in one respect, in the right. They see clearly enough that it is derogatory to the church to be the creature, the dependent, the tool of the state; without a will of its own, without any power of free movement or of spontaneous action. Grossly perverted, as, in our judgment, are their views of the true nature of the Christian church, as well as of the sort of authority and independence to which she ought to aspire, they do clearly perceive that it is unworthy of a great spiritual empire —such as that of Christianity is undoubtedly designed to be—to be in bondage to the civil power, to have its supreme officers appointed, and, if need be, deposed, its external and internal relations adjusted, its public documents discussed, its revenues managed by men, most of whom do not even profess much religious earnestness or zeal—some of whom avowedly have none —many of whom are but cold friends, and others open enemies. They cannot, therefore, but be galled by their present position, and all the more galled, the higher their ecclesiastical tone and pretensions. Chafing under this irritation, they have suffered themselves to give expression to sentiments and feelings which cannot but have tended to familiarize their own minds and those of their party, to the thought of ultimate separation from the state, as no such immitigable evil, and even in some degree to reconcile them to the change; and we sincerely hope and believe that such statements will be found of essential use in detaching churchmen from their prejudices, and inducing them fairly to entertain the subject, when the erroneous views and extravagant pretensions in which they originated shall have been renounced and exploded. Our readers may not be displeased to see a few brief specimens of the sort of statements we refer to. Nowhere are they found stronger than in the far famed Oxford Tracts, and in the public organs which are understood to be under the immediate control of members of the same party.

'The legislature,' says the author of the second Tract, 'has lately taken upon itself to remodel the dioceses of Ireland; a proceeding which involves the appointment of certain bishops over certain clergy, and of certain clergy under certain bishops, without the *church being consulted* in the matter. . . . Are we content to be accounted the mere creation of the state, as schoolmasters or teachers may be, or soldiers, or magistrates, or other public officers? Did the state make us? Can it unmake us? Can it send out missionaries? Can it arrange dioceses? Surely all these are spiritual functions; and laymen may as well set about preaching and consecrating the bread and wine as assume these?

. . . . Would St. Paul, with his good will, have suffered the *Roman power* to appoint Timothy Bishop of Miletus as well as Ephesus? Would Timothy, at such a bidding, have undertaken the charge? Is not the notion of such an order, such an obedience, absurd? Yet has it not been realized in what has lately happened? For in what is the English state at present different from the Roman formerly? Neither can be accounted members of the church of Christ. No one can say the British Legislature is in our communion, or that its members are necessarily even Christians. What pretence then has it for not merely advising, but superseding the ecclesiastical power?'—Tracts, No. 2, p. 2.

Surely this is a passage pregnant with instruction to every churchman, and one containing not a few questions which, considering all that the state does, and that habitually, he might find it not a little difficult to answer. But let us listen again to the same oracles.

The author of Tract 4, speaking of 'alterations in the Prayer Book,' says—

'The question follows; *where* is the competent authority for making alterations? Is it not also clear that it does not lie in the British legislature, which we know to be composed not only of believers, but also of infidels, heretics, and schismatics; and which for what we know may soon cease to be a Christian body, even in formal profession. Can even a committee of it, ever so carefully selected, absolve us from our subscriptions? Whence do the laity derive their power over the clergy? Can even the crown absolve us? or a commission from the crown? If then *some measure of tyranny* be ever practised against us, as regards the prayer-book, HOW ARE WE TO ACT?'—Tract 4, p. 8.

Again, in No. 58, the writer says—

'Seeing nothing but its tangible frame, conscious of its political existence alone, men naturally deem that the overthrow of these externals is the essential overthrow of the church; which will, as they suppose, cease to exist at all, when they shall have deprived it of all those symptoms of existence which their faculties can perceive. They know not—the church's enemies, till taught by fatal experience, never did know—that all which the utmost exertion of their violence can effect, will be but to bruise its heel. Its true, its inherent vitality, as it is beyond their ken, is also beyond their power; and in that vitality it may, if God so please, grow and flourish the most, at the very moment of their fancied triumph, in the supposed annihilation of its powers?'

One is ready to exclaim, 'Can men who write these things be members of an establishment so conditioned and so regulated as the church of England? Is Saul also amongst the prophets? But we think of No. 90 of this very series, and cease to wonder. Truth, however, is still truth, whoever may utter it; and truth the above passage undeniably is. But perhaps the strongest

things the Oxford Tracts contain on this subject, are to be found in No. 59, expressly on 'Church and State.' Of course the views and purposes of dissenters are very curiously presented, or rather misrepresented; but let us listen, and in good truth it is well worth listening to. 'We are very naturally jealous of the attempts which are making to disunite, as it is called, church and state; which, in fact, means neither more nor less, in the mouths of those who clamour for it, than a general confiscation of church property, and a repeal of the few remaining laws which make the true church the church of England. This is what dissenters mean by disuniting church and state; and we are all naturally anxious to avert a step at once so unjust towards man and sacrilegious towards God. Let us not imagine, however, that every one who apparently joins with us in this anxiety, must necessarily have the welfare of the church at heart. Many people seem to join us at this crisis, and protest loudly in favour of the union of church and state, who, nevertheless, mean by this, something very different from what dissenters mean, and from what we mean when we are opposing dissenters. The 'Union of Church and State,' *which many persons so call*, and are so anxious to preserve, is, in some points, *almost as great an evil* as it is confessedly in other points a good; and there are almost as many persons who support it for its bad points, as there are who hate it for its good. To make this plain, I shall endeavour to explain what it is that the union of church and state consists in, as now enforced by the law of the land. It consists in two things, State Protection, and State Interference.' He then proceeds to enumerate the four following points in which state protection is exercised.

'1. In securing to us by law some *small portion* (?) of those ample endowments which the piety of our forefathers set apart for the maintenance of true (?) religion in this country. 2. It further consists in enabling us to raise a tax on real property for the keeping our parish churches in tolerable and decent repair through the country. 3. In allowing thirty bishops to sit and vote in the House of Lords. 4. In the law de excommunicato capiendo, by which the state engages that on receiving due notice of the excommunication of any given person, he shall be arrested, and put in prison until he is absolved.' The three first they defend, the last they have the grace to acknowledge to be 'a bad useless law, which cannot be done away with too soon.'

But pleasant as state protection may be, if it were but possible to receive without return—if the state could but give, 'hoping for nothing again,' woful is the contrast when we come to state interference.

'Such is state protection,' continues the writer; 'now on the other hand, let us consider the existing *set off* against it, which is demanded

of us. This is state interference, which encumbers us in ways too numerous to be catalogued, but is especially grievous in regard to the two following particulars. 1. State Patronage. 2. Church Discipline. . . . . The appointment of all our bishops, and in much the greater number of instances, of those who are to undertake the cure of souls, is vested in the hands of individuals irresponsible and unpledged to any opinions in any conduct; *laymen, good or bad, as it may happen, orthodox or heretic, faithful or infidel.* The bishops, every one of them, are, as a matter of fact, appointed by the prime minister for the time being, who, since the repeal of the Test Act, may be an avowed Socinian or even Atheist. . . . . It cannot be denied that at present it [the church] is treated far more arbitrarily, and is more completely at the mercy of the chance government of the day, *than even our fathers were under the worst tyranny of the worst times.* . . . . These are among the effects of state interference, as it affects church patronage. As to church discipline, without entering into the reasons for restoring it, it may be sufficient to mention one fact, showing the practical effect of the law to *suppress* it.'—No. 59, pp. 3—8.

'We throw ourselves into the arms of the state,' says the British critic, (No. 59, p. 121) and in that close embrace forget that the church was meant to be catholic. . . . Can any one doubt that the British power is not considered a church power by any country whatever into which it comes? and if so, is it possible that the English church, which is so closely connected with that power, can be said in any true sense to exert a catholic influence, or to deserve the catholic name? How can it ever be called catholic, except as acting *out* of its own territory? *and when did the rulers of the English church ever move one step beyond the precincts, or without the leave of the imperial power? Pudet hæc opprobria, &c., there is no denying them. . . . .*' —p. 123. 'There is among us a *growing feeling* that to be a *mere establishment* is unworthy of the catholic church, and to be shut out from the rest of Christendom is not a subject of boasting.'—p. 134.

'We cordially go along with the author whose work we have been reviewing,' says the same journal, 'in what we may call his *unnational* spirit. We can have no sympathy with the Gallican party, so far as it is at issue with the ultra-montane! National theories, even the Gallican, (which is also more or less the theory of every *state* in the Roman communion) appear to us to involve a subtle erastianism, besides betokening an inadequate estimate of the fulness and freedom of Gospel privileges.'—Vol. 30, p. 465.

Whether the views of the writer respecting what may be 'the fulness and freedom of Gospel privileges,' be correct or not, and whether that 'fulness and freedom' would be likely to be secured by the much desired fraternization, or by 'adopting Rome as the centre,' is beside our present purpose to inquire. We proceed with our extracts.

'To return to the character of our church divines [of the seven-

teenth century] they do, indeed, in expressing their views on the alliance of church and state, and *in their controversy with the Roman-catholics*, make considerable use of a phraseology, which we should not wish to see continued, and which we confess ourselves to regard as the natural result of a certain insulated and imperfect position into which our church had been thrown. They are apt, in their *mode of speaking*, to mix up church and state too closely and indiscriminately together, and in their gratitude for the assistance of the civil power, not to make sufficient allowance for the *independence* (!) of the ecclesiastical. . . .' —*British Critic*, vol. xxxii., p. 222.

'It is the opinion of the Quarterly Review, '*that the church is not now in a worse position with respect to the state, than it was in the days of Whitgift, Hooker, and their successors.*' Now with all deference to the respectable quarter from which this assertion proceeds, we cannot call it anything else than a palpable and egregious mistake as to a simple matter of fact. The church *is* in a very different and in a much *lower* position, with respect to the state, than it was in the times of these divines. Then it was *coextensive and identical* (in respect of those who composed it) with the state; when men ceased to be members of the former, they were also deprived of their position in the latter; a seceder from the church, was as such a criminal and a malefactor. . . . The theory of the identity of church and state was all powerful, and was the basis of the whole constitution. We put it then to any person as a simple question of fact, Is or is not this order of things reversed? Are persons now obliged to go to church in order to escape going to gaol, &c.'—*Ib.*, vol. xxxii., p. 321.

By the way, what a curious notion of what constitutes a 'worse or *lower* position of the church,' relatively to the state must this writer have, who thinks that such *lower* position is proved because 'seceders from the church' are no longer '*as such* criminals and malefactors,' and because men are not now presented with that pleasant alternative, 'church or gaol.' But it is not to our purpose to notice the inconsistencies with which the admissions we are recording are connected, nor the desperate errors with which glimpses of a great truth are still involved; all we have to do with is the admissions themselves.

'The divines whom King William III. introduced in the place of the Hammonds, the Taylors, the Kens, the school of Hoadley and their successors, were all admirers of *establishments and state religions*; they only wished to separate them from whatever was divine in constitution and doctrine, from church independence, and a dogmatic or authoritative creed.'—*Ib.*, vol. xxxii., p. 434.

'The church-rate is vexatious to the wealthy heathen or dissenter, and *absolutely oppressive to the poor*; nor are the persuasions and arguments on which it is urged always of the truest or most satisfactory character. The malcontent is reminded that in the gospel taxes were to be paid even to a Pagan persecutor; an illustration as

little consolatory to the dissenter as it is flattering to the church. He is further told that the state must choose and maintain our religion; a necessity by no means obvious to one who is subscribing annually twenty times his church-rate towards the establishment of the contrary principle; all are told, especially the poor, that the burden is on the property, and the occupier does not really pay it, as he took the land subject and so forth; this averment is contradicted by the very act of demand which is made on the actual occupier; nor again is it pleasant to be told that a payment, formally religious, is really involuntary, and that the church-rate, so far from being heart-service, is neither eye-service, hand-service, nor body-service at all, but merely house and land service, &c.'—*Ib.*, vol. xxxii., p. 480.

The whole passage is too long for insertion, but consists of a series of arguments which would sound admirably in the lips of a dissenter, and which nothing but a most marvellous change of sentiments surely could have extorted from the writers of the British Critic. May we hope that future attempts to get rid of the church-rates may meet with some favour from the high-church party? Again, on the subject of state support in general, this journal says,—

'We are not here implying that we desire larger offerings to the church out of the national fund; on the contrary, when we consider how great a proportion of the contributors to that fund are aliens to the English church, how many also of our legislators are its professed enemies, how constantly all offerings to the church are balanced (?) by similar largesses to schismatical bodies, or other still more serious compromise of principle, we have no wish whatever to receive any further boons from an ungracious and a truth-neglecting legislature.'—*Ib.*, vol. xxxi., p. 115.

A little *pique*, or a sort of 'fox and the grapes' acquiescence in all this, no doubt. But the principle is very sound, if the church would but have the honesty to act upon it.

'Your protest against Rome,' says a writer in the same journal, to a supposed objector, 'unavoidably narrows your position. . . . . You must be on terms with the state, else how withstand Rome? and, for the same reason, you must make common cause with every shade and shape of protestantism; you must, by every lawful concession, strengthen the hands of the state to keep out Rome; and, on the other hand, you must endure to lose, and even dare to crush, everything that even ignorance can charge with Romanism, in order to strengthen the state and secure a protestant king. Well you have done all this, and so far have accomplished your object. The means have been adequate to the end. But will truth, will religion endure this? *Will the King of kings suffer his kingdom to be made the footstool of an earthly supremacy?*'—*Ib.*, vol. xxxi., p. 53.

'No considerate person will deny,' says Mr. Newman, in the opening

sentences of his 'Church of the Fathers,' 'that there is much in the spirit of the times and in the actual changes which the British constitution has lately undergone, which makes it probable, or not improbable, that a material alteration will soon take place in the relations of the church towards the state, to which it has hitherto been united. I do not say that it is out of the question that things may return to their former quiet and pleasant course as in the good old time of King George III., but the very chance that they will not, makes it a practical concern for every churchman to prepare himself for a change, and a practical question for the clergy, by *what instruments* the authority of religion is to be supported, should the protection and recommendation of the government be withdrawn. Truth, indeed, will always support itself in the world by its native vigour, it will never die while heaven and earth last, but be handed down from saint to saint until the end of all things. . . . Hitherto the English church has depended on the state,—i.e., on the ruling powers in the country—the king and the aristocracy; and this is so *natural* and *religious a position* of things when viewed in the abstract. . . . that we must ever look back upon the period of ecclesiastical history so characterised with affectionate thoughts, particularly in the reigns of our blessed martyr St. Charles and King George the Good. But these recollections of the past must not engross our minds, or hinder us from looking at things as they are, and as they will be soon, and from inquiring what is intended by providence to take the place of the time-honoured instrument which He has broken (if it be yet broken), the royal and aristocratic power. I shall offend many men when I say, we must *look to the people*.'

He goes on to say that he can 'well understand the feelings' of repugnance with which this proposal will be received.

'I confess I have before now had a great repugnance to the notion myself; and if I have overcome it, and turned from the government to the people, it has been simply because I was *forced* to do so. . . . But in truth the prospect is not so bad as it seems at first sight. . . . And what in time to come may become necessary, is a more religious state of things also.' He also admits 'the undeniable fact that the church, when purest and most powerful, *has* depended for its influence on its consideration with the many.'—Church of the Fathers, pp. 1—4.

But one of the most striking testimonies we have lately seen is from a quarter which, till very recently, we should hardly have expected to furnish such goodly matter. We extract from the *Times* of February 27, 1843.

'We leave out of sight all those rights and duties which spring directly from the notion of an establishment, and wish to examine what the church has, and what she has not a right to demand, merely on those principles of toleration now universally admitted. We do it advisedly. For thus stands the case:—In former days, the law considered the church and nation as identical, the government chose, or

had chosen, a religion for the nation; that religion it forced the clergy to dispense and the people to receive. . . . This theory has, of course, passed away. An Englishman is no longer, even by a legal fiction, *ipso facto*, a churchman. The church, indeed, legally speaking, is still, in many senses, the national church. But her peculiarities, as national, (i. e., as established,) have, in a great measure, fallen from her, *and are, perhaps, destined to do so still more.* At least, her nationality has to be adapted to a state of things not contemplated in that theory on which her present legal constitution is based. . . . Nor is the state less concerned than the church in a satisfactory adjustment of these questions. The one finds itself impeded by the same extinct theories which hamper the other. By the relics of these, the reform of pseudo-ecclesiastical jurisdiction is impeded, churchmen are fretted, dissenters are irritated, and we may finally add, some important patronage which would, not unnaturally, be vested in the crown or its law officers, remains in ecclesiastical hands.'

To these testimonies we might add some hundreds more, if they were wanted, from the avowed organs of the church of England. They serve to show, we think incontestably, that however obscure or defective the views of those who utter them, with whatsoever errors combined, by whatsoever motives inspired, the great *principle* for which dissenters plead, is making rapid progress in their minds, that they feel circumstances compelling them to construct a new theory, and that their present position is absolutely untenable.

Let us now briefly consider what is said and thought on the same great subject abroad, as indicated in the work, the title of which is given at the head of this article, and which is undoubtedly the production of one of the most accomplished, philosophic, and *earnest* minds which have ever been employed upon it. M. Vinet has long been favourably known to French literature. His works are numerous; one, (the best known,) which appeared so early as 1828, was closely related to his present subject, and shows that the whole question must have been his study for many years. It was entitled 'Mémoire en faveur de la Liberté des Cultes; ouvrage qui a obtenu le prix dans le concours ouvert par la Societé de la Morale Chretienne.' It was a very full and admirable treatise, exhibiting much acuteness, learning, and eloquence.

The present work, the fruit of yet maturer thought and more extensive study, will assuredly do no discredit to the reputation which its predecessor had already conferred on the author. It is of course impossible for us to enter so fully as could be wished into the merits of a volume of such bulk, the excellence of which very mainly consists in the coherence and relation of its several parts. We can but state in general that it is distinguished

by great comprehensiveness, and in some parts subtlety of reasoning, (here and there we think it is almost too copious and refined for popular purposes;) by considerable imaginativeness and beauty of style, often rising into very fervid eloquence; by a most blameless and lovely spirit of charity and moderation, conjoined nevertheless with that deep seriousness and earnestness which show that in the author's mind the question he treats is the question of questions—one of vital practical importance to the progress and final triumph of Christianity. With this general character of the work we shall now proceed to enumerate the topics of the several chapters, and to furnish the reader with a free translation of some of the more striking extracts, which, however, for the reasons already specified, can give but a very inadequate idea of the whole work. It is only further necessary to be observed that the two parts of the work—that 'sur la Manifestation des Convictions Religieuses,' and that 'sur la Separation de L'Eglise et de L'Etat,' are indissolubly connected with one another in the author's mind, and are constantly viewed as mutually related. Indeed, he has avowedly regarded the latter subject, not under all its aspects, but as modified, in various degrees, directly or indirectly, by the former. The first part, after a copious introduction, is divided into six chapters. The first and second treat 'of the manifestation of *convictions* in general,' and examine a certain objection; the third and fourth treat 'of the *duty* of expressing religious belief;' the fifth treats of 'the application of the principle to various religious positions,' and the sixth is on 'the different *modes* of this manifestation.' The second part is divided into eleven chapters, the first and second of which are on 'Persecution and Protection,' and examine particularly 'Si l'Etat est qualifié pour protéger la religion.' The third is an introduction to the examination of objections, and investigates the question, 'Comment il faut croire la verité.' The fourth examines the 'Objection derived from the *idea* of the state.' The fifth lays down the *principles* of Christianity on this topic. The sixth notices 'other *theoretical* objections.' The seventh, eighth, and ninth, 'such as are taken from a practical point of view,' and examine the question, 'Has not the Church *need* of the State?' The tenth is on the contrary question, 'Has not the State *need* of the Church?' The eleventh and concluding chapter is on 'Systemes de transition et de transaction.' The whole is followed by a copious appendix of notes and illustrations. We now proceed to our extracts. The first shall be from the discussion on the question, 'Has not the Church need of the State?'

'Before contracting this alliance, Christianity had passed three centuries in isolation. What, during these three centuries, was its internal

condition? How did it correspond with the spirit of its Founder and to the end of its institution? What were, during that period, its energy and its progress? If it was *then*, in all essential respects, at least equal to what it has since shewn itself, what can be said in favour of the alliance? Now it is universally acknowledged that the period was not inferior to any of those which have succeeded it. It is certain that, in proportion, it extended the dominion of Christianity much more widely than have all after ages. To look only at that aspect of the question, those first ages are, beyond all comparison, superior. And if that *external* development ought not to be assumed as the measure of the church's internal life, that internal life, contemplated closely and by itself, does not, I presume, dread comparison with any more modern age. If our admiration of the age of Apostles and Fathers require to be diminished by one half, that age, notwithstanding, will remain, in our judgment, and in that of all the world, the golden age of the Christian church.

'But,' it will be said, 'that glory had its decline; that golden age was already but the age of silver when the church espoused the empire. That marriage occurred in the nick of time. But reflect a little. The malady of the church was of no such nature as that alliance could heal; on the contrary, it necessarily aggravated it. That distemper of the church consisted in a proud consciousness of its external strength; that disease was the subjection of 'faith to sight,' and by consequence, a proportionate diminution of faith in relation to the unseen. For just as the Christian feels that 'when he is weak then he is strong,' so does he feel that, 'when he is strong then he is weak.' A false confidence originates real terrors. Arrived at the summit of temporal prosperity, the church was frightened, and threw herself into the arms of the state. Precisely because her credit had increased in the world, she should have avoided all *solidarite*, all contact with power; she did just the contrary, and seeing danger where in fact was her security, she sought security just where was her danger. Was she no longer blameable then? Did she not offer a reply different from that which Jesus Christ had taught her, to that temptation of the Prince of Darkness, 'I will give thee all the power of the kingdoms of the world, and their glory.' It is true that the experience which she has since acquired was wanting to her; the history of the ancient chosen people consecrated in her eyes the principle of union; all the omens were favourable, all the auguries propitious; but it is not the less true that the secret, intimate cause of that sad step was the enfeeblement of her *internal life;* that enfeeblement, which ought to have warned the church to recur to her origin and to reform herself, suggested to her, on the contrary, the seeking strength elsewhere; that very illusion was part of her malady, which consisted precisely in the predominance of the 'flesh over the spirit,' of the visible over the invisible; it is because her enfeebled eyes no longer discerned 'the cloud,' that she exclaimed, like ancient Israel, 'Make us Gods to go before us;' and if she had need of alliance with the secular power, it was in order to learn, by a hard experiment, to avoid so dangerous a connexion, and to respect, above everything, the strength which is invisible.

'Without doubt, the course of events, and a continuous succession of unexpected blessings, must have brought on that perilous crisis for Christianity. When the church, as if she had been the widow of her invisible spouse, suffered the imperial ring to be placed on her finger, it appears to me that, powerful externally, strong in the extension of her conquests and the expressive silence of Paganism, her ancient enemy, she feels herself internally failing; she seeks, in default of her internal strength, which was extinguished, a foreign energy, which disguises her weakness from all the world, and first, from herself; and just as a river, wearied in its course, lays its waves to sleep in the ample bason of a lake, *she* also ceases to flow, except when she recovers her course again at the outlet of that 'dead sea,' which has no other movement than that which it may receive from tempests. And what has the church been since that period, which does not justify this image? What important and salutary agitation has she been subjected to, which has not reproduced the character of her earlier years? Do you not see, from epoch to epoch, the life which she conceals asking for an outlet, 'going without the camp,' to use the phrase of the Apostle, and re-seeking the wilderness, the witness of her first conflict and of her first victories? Then, even though united to the state, she is independent, because she rules. . . . A deep instinct reclaims her incessantly to the traces of Him who had not a place where to lay his head, and whose kingdom is not of this world. A 'stranger and pilgrim,' like each of her true children, she prefers to the house of stone, the light tent which is rolled up in an instant, (an abode which takes not its possessor captive,) and which he carries with him. . . .

'But to consider only great *external* operations,—is it the state which effects them? Is it, at least, under its auspices that they are effected? It would be strange indeed to give to the state the honour of achievements which it has not been able to prevent, and of which, so to speak, it has only been the formal witness. Assuredly the state has been altogether innocent of every sublime and hardy enterprise and achievement in the affairs of religion, throughout the whole alliance; and everything proves that it would have been equally effected, and much better, without such alliance. How many admirable things in the history of Christianity have taken place in the bosom even of the *established church*, to which that establishment has contributed nothing, if indeed, it has not rather placed an obstacle in the way? How many great and noble things, greater far than those it has itself accomplished, have been effected without its patronage, and even beyond its pale? The state has remained a stranger—often has even shown itself hostile to every generous and courageous effort of the church, or rather of religion. This opposition arises from its very nature. It is not, indeed, in prospect of these great works, nor out of any interest in any great religious result, but from a wholly temporal regard to order and morality, that it has adopted religion; it is for her dowry that the state has married her; for *it*, not for *her*; whence we may easily gather, that the state will be but little pleased, and even much displeased, with whatever she may do apart from, or beyond her relations to itself. It

is agreeable to the state to have a submissive, well-disciplined companion; all eccentricity is displeasing to it, and religion lives in such eccentricity. It is not the state, then, that will lend a hand to deeds of sacred daring on the part of faith; they will be done without it, but they will be done; and their being done, will prove that religion can effect great things without the support of the temporal power. Will it be said that it is the temporal power which has placed her *in a condition* to do these great things? But she had already done many others before being taken under the protection of the temporal power; nay, she has perpetually done things as great, without the state's troubling itself about the matter, except for the purpose of opposition. And after all, is it the civil government that has sent courageous missionaries into China and Japan? Is it a government which has civilised Paraguay? Were they not monks, who, by the way, regarded themselves in this enterprise as above the laws and authority of their country? Is it by the orders and at the charge of government that the humble 'Moravian Brethren' have emulated, but in a purer spirit, the enterprise of the Jesuits of Paraguay? How is it possible not to think that those who have done the greater could have done the less, and that the same charity which has diffused Christianity over the whole world, could easily, in those countries whence it took its flight, provide for the necessities of the population, organize a church and a worship ; in a word, erect an establishment as solid and regular as that which religion has received from the state? Are parishes more difficult to organise and govern than states?

'If we look only at the funds of the church, her means of subsistence, we shall see that she owes the state very little, or rather, that she owes it nothing. It is at her own proper charge that she is maintained in the majority of nations, whether she has kept the fund under her own guardianship, and at her own disposal, or whether the state has incorporated them with its own treasures. That she has been despoiled is perhaps a great injustice, but it is no great evil. That her right of possession should be limited by law, we care not to complain. The church of Christ was not designed to accumulate. She 'walks by faith, not by sight;' and certainly, the sight of an assured *capital* is not calculated to maintain her, in relation to her master, in that attitude of supplication and dependence which can alone become her. Her capital consists in the faith and love of her members; her resources are, in principle, all spiritual, and woe to every institution which insures to her, her existence. But, in a word, it is not the less true that the church, in relation to her funds, has no need of the state, and she has proved it. If we have any doubt of this now-a-days, it is because, accustomed to reckon on the subsidies of the state, we do not easily realize to ourselves a different *regime*, although those subsidies themselves are furnished (under the collective name of the state) by *individuals;* nor reflect that the separation of the two societies would not lead in that respect to any material difference. The change would be altogether moral: we should give what we gave before, but we should know to whom, and for what we gave it; we should look more

closely, and with deeper interest, into the application of our gifts; and lastly, he whom conscience did not prompt to give, would not give at all. In what, I ask, would the position of the church, in relation to her *matériel*, become more difficult. It will not be said, that if it is easy for her to procure the funds of which she stands in need, she is not capable of employing, of administering them. What reason, in effect, could there be to doubt it? What reasons are there not, on the contrary, for thinking that the funds, and the mode of using them, are equally in her power.'—pp. 347—355.

Our next extract shall be on other aspects of the same great question.

'It is difficult to believe that serious Christians can imagine the protection of the secular power to be the sole condition of the existence of a religion founded on the 'Rock of Ages.' If they are Christians, they are, without doubt, insensible to the severe and sublime delight of feeling themselves tossed by the storm in a ship which cannot be wrecked. But they will allege other fears; they have no fear of seeing Christianity perish, but of seeing it retarded. They will tell us that Christianity is a child of the desert, reclaimed and polished by civilization, and that they are not willing that it should return to its forests. They fear on its behalf the influence of the wilderness and of independence. They see it by anticipation, submitting to all the caprices of an unbridled imagination, divided and subdivided without end, and creating for itself within that 'foolishness' which is essential to it and divine, another species of 'foolishness' altogether human, the fruit of a too introspective or a too subtle habit of thought.

'It is strange, we reply, that the same faith which compels us to believe that the existence of Christianity is independent of its terrestrial condition, does not compel us also to reckon on the assistance and operation of the Holy Spirit in the church.

'It is strange that we should find a preservation from these disorders, only in the influence (altogether external and material) of an institution which can repress the excess of life only on condition of repressing life itself.

'Moreover, we may ask, Where, then, is order, and in what does it consist? In uniformity? Who has affirmed it? Where is the proof? Where there is diversity in the very nature of things, there diversity is order, and uniformity disorder. Uniformity has a flattering appearance; it satisfies our indolence, and craving for repose; but is it on that account the seal of truth? Far from it. When we consider the nature of Christianity, its multitude of phases which correspond to all the aspects of human nature, its comprehensiveness and flexibility, by which each man receives it as if that message destined for all men had been addressed solely to himself, the astonishing diversity of characters, the unbounded liberty of the imagination, the incalculable susceptibilities of conscience, and lastly, the innumerable interpretations with which we have perplexed the text of the Bible, we are absolutely forced to conclude that uniformity is not the seal of the truth, but of a falsehood, or at all events, of a fiction. In a domain

like this, life cannot be without diversity, or rather life generates diversity. And if the institution of state churches boasts of realizing the phenomenon of uniformity in so vast a domain, by that very vaunt it condemns itself.

'They press our principle to its utmost rigour, and they show us that it destroys in their very germ all associations; for, say they, what with one nice distinction and another, and separation after separation, the individual ends with finding himself absolutely alone, and each man being a church of himself, there is a church no longer.

'Alas! I would that this fear had more ground to justify it. They exclaim against *individuality*, in favour of society, without perceiving that it is precisely because individuality is feeble that society is so also; without perceiving that the loss of the former can only impoverish the latter. They forget that the cohesion (more or less strong) of society is measured by individuality itself, which is composed of conviction and of will. Who has said that individuality is formed solely of what divides and insulates, and not rather of what binds and unites together? How long will they persist in confounding *individuality* with *individualism?* If the true social unity is concert of thoughts, and concurrence of wills, society will be so much the more strong and real, in proportion as it has in each of its members more both of thought and of will.

'On the other hand, that force, which impelling us to seek those who resemble ourselves, renders us like others, and rubs down, even to entire obliteration, the strong edges of our individuality, has need of being restrained and moderated. Man feels that it is not good for him to live alone; and while his self-love insulates him, another instinct, often the very same instinct, leads him to seek, in spite of all differences, the point of common agreement where he may unite with his fellows. That point is always found; by some, because they have resolved on finding it, by others, for a higher and better reason. All that is equally profound is similar; and if there be a religion so intimate and serious that it can vibrate through the innermost depths of being, it gives back there essentially the same sound. Such is the nature of Christianity. No religion can present greater diversity of external appearance, or, fundamentally, be more strictly *one*. No religion produces more sects, and none maintains amongst the truly religious members of these different sects more intimate unity. . . . . We must confide in this secret and powerful principle of unity. We need not expect at last to see only insulated individuals in the sphere of religion; the opposite fear will, to the world's end, be far more reasonable: justly apprehensive of seeing it all at once resuming some form of factitious consolidation, it rather becomes to avoid the grossest and the falsest forms under which that consolidation can take effect.

'And even then, you will proceed to tell me, we shall not avoid it absolutely; we shall see in these independent communities religion *coagulating* afresh; we shall see it reproducing, under other conditions, that servitude from which we have pretended to escape; the greater part will find a pope and a master in the first man they meet

with of powerful eloquence and of contagious enthusiasm. Where, even in those congregations, of which neither the formation nor the maintenance appertains to the state, do we find convictions really those of the individual,—religion truly personal? I reply, that even, if at a given moment we should not find more of this on one side than on the other, it would become us always to give the preference to the system which does not consecrate the idea of a *collective* religion, and of the secular power controlling or determining the spiritual. If, after this, the individual, free to choose, has chosen not to be himself, it is a fault which belongs to himself, and with which no institution is chargeable. Whatever the influence or ascendancy which the circumstances in which providence has placed us may exert over us, this is but a simple fact, establishes no principle, and invalidates none; while the alliance of the church with the state, superadded out of our own head to our natural relations, introduces a principle which reacts upon the very *idea* of religion, denaturalizes and corrupts it. We ought well to understand that it is no indifferent matter as to whether we set out from a true principle or a false principle; and that the road is far shorter from error to error, than from the *truth* to error.

'If the national establishment absorbed all sects, or prevented their existence, that triumph, instead of being matter of praise, would rather furnish a theme of accusation, for it is evident that it would be obtained at the expense of human nature and of religion; neither the one nor the other of which can endure such a unity. Life and diversity are, in this sphere, strictly correlative. There is no life where there are no sects; uniformity is the symptom of death. At all times, at least in those of violent oppression and constant *terrorism*, and often in consequence of them, there will be sects by the side of the national establishment. These sects, more or less declared, will attract to themselves by little and little the purest sap of the church; and the national constitution will only keep, like a too close sieve, its grosser portions. If it says, 'so much the better; I will be the hospital, the infirmary of the church,' we tell it that the true hospital for this kind of malady is the open air, and that those who appear too feeble for liberty are precisely those who have the greatest need of it.

'We ought to understand that the instinct for consolidation, when left to itself, is weaker, and its effects less irrevocable than when the system of union has, so to speak, attached religion to the soil. The principle of individuality, that of personal responsibility, remains intact. The spring may be compressed, it is not broken. Whether, then, we contemplate the one danger or its opposite, nothing can persuade us to prefer the church united to the state, to the church separated from the state. True unity is guaranteed by individuality itself, and individuality here finds itself on its true ground.'—pp. 366—372.

Our next extract shall be from the chapter entitled, 'Has not the State need of the Church?' He thus refutes the false sentimentality which imaginative minds oppose to his views, and

in the course of his reasoning makes some beautiful allusions to his own mental character and history.

'The party we oppose is essentially *sentimental*, and it is to save a *sentiment* that they alternately appeal to logic and to science. Under the name of a *theory*, if we examine it attentively, we shall find in effect a certain moral temperament, and certain habitudes of heart. Now, in the judgment of persons of this character, we strip human life of its beauty. We despoil society by denationalising religion. All the poetry of which the popular life is susceptible has consisted precisely in that union which we condemn. It is because the State has been Christian that the people have had Christian morals, or that Christianity, become popular, has been injected, so to speak, into the minutest capillaries of the social body. Lay aside, they appear to us to say, lay aside that pruning-knife, the implement only of mischief. Be it so; but it is not from our hands only that it will be necessary to wrest it; it is in hands more powerful. All the world, without toiling in the same spirit as ourselves, is toiling in the same direction. Even our adversaries have been beforehand with us. The *poetry* of the union has long since disappeared; there remains only the *prose*, and that assuredly none of the best. The poetry of the future is all in our hopes. This divorce between two parties, mutually abandoned of each other, constitutes but a prelude to a more intimate union; but the divorce in itself, we are agreed, has no great poetic charm. The fact is not new. It is just the poetry of the past which Symmachus resought when he stood before the tottering altar of victory. All ruins are touching, and in relation to the majority of men, hope is less beautiful than remembrance. We who are now speaking are precisely men of that stamp, and we have probably drunk more deeply of that cup than any of them. But the axe has been laid at the root of the tree by an all-powerful hand, by the hand of him who lops every fruitless tree, and prunes every branch which still retains the sap, that it may become more fruitful. Our efforts will not prevent the result; and to speak truth, is there still anything to destroy?

'But must all that is deep and touching which Christianity has infused into manners, disappear with an association long since virtually dissolved? Yes, if religion is itself to disappear, and if the masses are to become less imbued than before with that divine life. But there were Christian 'manners' before there was a Christian state, and nothing hinders but that Christianity may achieve again what she has achieved already. We confess we should be as sensible of this loss as anyone, but we do not fear it. It is not *we* who confound the true and immutable form of religion with that dry dialectic or abstract asceticism which so imprudently denies a part of man and of life. This *crisis* of religion is not the whole of religion. The river, which appears to be precipitated entire into a straight and deep channel, will flow towards the sea by various mouths, and embrace in the network of a fertile *delta*, all the land which it is destined to irrigate. The gospel needs not the state to teach it to be enlarged, human, liberal;

it is all this of itself, and it is from it that the state will itself learn to become so. All the birds of the sky will find a shelter in the branches of that great tree. Let it develope itself according to its nature and true force; it will well suffice, if we suffer it to do this, for all the various necessities of the soul, of thought, and of life.'—pp. 400—403.

Our last extract shall be from the closing chapter, in which the author shows the impossibility of constructing any *tertium quid* between the opposing systems; expresses his confidence in the approaching triumph of his principles, and of their important bearing on the destinies of the gospel; and indicates the duty of every Christian man to use his utmost efforts to diffuse and establish them.

'Men are terrified at the transition from one system to another. We wish it to be progressive and gradual: we foresee it abrupt and sudden. We surely believe that it will have this character. History does not encourage us to hope for pleasant transitions in this province. The path of the human spirit is like a giant's staircase, of which each step needs to be divided; for want of this, humanity is so often out of breath, so often falls back and bruises itself. Long intervals of repose alternate with painful and desperate leaps, and these invariably divide between them the itinerary of humanity. Its character is at once solemn and tragical. Let us endeavour, though against all hope, to transform into a gentle declivity that fatal descent, bloody with our falls; yet resign ourselves without a murmur to the destiny which we have prepared for ourselves.

'To charge truth with all the inconveniences inseparable from reformation, would be more than to perpetuate error—it would consecrate it; it would efface the distinction between falsehood and truth, between justice and injustice. These inconveniences are imputable to error. She is responsible for the obstacles herself has created. The union of the church with the state is a fact so serious, so complicated, a fact which so modifies all the parts of social life, and even the conditions of individual existence, that the evil which it has effected becomes an obstacle in the way of its own correction, just as slavery appears to have rendered slaves incapable of becoming free. Man would have great reason to complain if evil were to become a guarantee for its own continuance. The healing of an ancient abuse is always painful; and no reformation would ever be possible, if only to be effected on the condition that it is to occasion no trouble to society.

'We have only one thing that we can do, and that is to make the descent more gentle; and we know but one way of doing this—THAT OF PREPARING MEN'S MINDS.

'I say that we can only make the descent more gentle; for on the one hand, our principles do not permit us to *effect* the change; and on the other, if we wished to do this, the truth would be more powerful than we are. . . . .

'And in effect, does there remain anything else to be done? is there anything better to do, when a change is inevitable, and all facts con-

spire to produce it? when all the bonds of the ancient institution are relaxed? when the new relations of society repel it as by instinct? when all progress must be at the expense of this revolution? when the ancient institution is absolutely opposed to that social future which is universally foreseen, and universally invoked? Point me to one notion of our epoch, one institution, one hope, which does not confess in the confusion of the spiritual and the secular, an obstacle, a source of embarrassment, or at all events, an outwork that is to be carried? With what *reality* is it in harmony? If it has its congruities with the past, with what does it correspond at the present moment? Well, those who see in the separation of these two spheres of action only what truth and necessity absolutely demand, what will they do if they love peace? They will, as far as they can, put the public mind into harmony with *facts*. They will be agitators, but agitators in the interest of peace.

'They cannot indeed keep pace with *events*. The social necessity will have accomplished its task before they have fully accomplished theirs. The Americans had decreed the system which we are advocating before they had the system in their hearts; perhaps even at the present moment they have not mastered the philosophy of their institution; they were an empirical people, they thought scarcely of anything but experience. How will the change pass on our old soil of Europe? People repeat, and with reason, that we ought to gather fruits only when they are ripe; yet civilization has seldom gathered any, except when green;—nay, it will not even *gather* them; it collects them at the foot of the tree, from whence a violent shock has shaken them. We would wish to hasten the maturity of the fruit; are we wrong? Is there, I ask, one other way open to the friends of public peace?

'In acting thus, we are far less responsible than others (above all, far less than our opponents) for any of the violent consequences, to which a revolution of opinion, probably sudden, and premature, may lead. But we are bound to confess that, even under this aspect, we have familiarized our minds to it. The time is past in which we might have said with Curiatius,—

> 'At duty's call I fly with ardour still,
> Though fear and doubt my trembling heart may fill.'

'We have no fear of that morrow, of which the dawn we know will be perhaps severe, yet pure. Christianity herself gives us an account of this so dreaded morrow. The anxiety of many, however, in relation to the approach of the coming transformation of the social condition, neither offends nor astonishes us. Every crisis is accompanied with perturbation. In these solemn moments, the human mind 'staggers like a drunken man.' [He proceeds to say, that he fears nothing further than this.] 'At most (and by courtesy rather than from conviction) do we admit that the vessel, when it shall have been launched into the deep, may vibrate for a moment on its keel, and trace its first course in foam; but we shall have nearly renounced our

faith if we can fear anything more; or rather, if we have not much more to hope. Let us boldly say it; if it were true that religion could not survive its artificial relations and powers as connected with the state, —nay, if it were but true that its condition would be made worse by the fact of that separation, we might as well from that hour abandon it, and seek in some ancient error, or in some modern system, the consolation of that deep and intimate misery, which, till then, by the aid of a sagacious policy, it had so pleasantly, so complaisantly cajoled.

'In the chimerical dread of some infinite evils, or the more specious anticipation of a temporary disturbance, we stand haggling with a necessity which never exacts more than is due; we dream of impossible accommodations; we seek to *mitigate* the system; we attempt to conciliate conflicting interests, the liberty of the state, and the liberty of the church. We desire that the church, though chained, incorporated with the state, should have, nevertheless, her proper life, her spontaneous movement, self-government—a legitimate claim, yet still not the less exorbitant. It would seem, I confess, that to demand liberty, life, is to demand only what is strictly necessary and strictly just. Yes, except in the case of 'alliance with the state,' there is nothing in the claim but what is both necessary and just; but in the system of 'alliance,' the demand is exorbitant. Nothing is more natural on the part of the church than to aspire to life; but that life, which in the system of separation has nothing alarming to the state, becomes terrible when it exerts itself in the state's own bosom; because (complicated with foreign elements) it is no longer the same, it is no longer pure; because the love of domination, so common and so dangerous amongst churchmen, may stealthily elevate ambition, under the guise of humility, to the very pinnacle of power; because to organize the life of the church, would be to set up a formidable rival. This true instinct, which again never fails of assuming an exaggerated form, keeps the government in an attitude of habitual distrust, and explains to us, without justifying, the thousand *tracasseries*, the thousand shackles with which it impedes the activity of religion and her ministers; the thousand injurious precautions and vexatious pretensions which it opposes to the most legitimate modes of religious action, . . . an habitual state of uneasiness and tension, interrupted by deplorable scandals, and lastly, a silent and perpetual war, under the derisive name of an alliance, where the forces of both parties are engaged, and in which their dignity is lost.

'So many irritating collisions, such painful experience, have led certain countries to limit, nearly as follows, the pretended alliance of the two societies. On the part of the state, there is a declaration of incompetence in matter of doctrine; on the part of the church, a renunciation of self-government and of ecclesiastical life; and on these conditions public worship is to be maintained by the state. The *salary* is to all appearance the only bond which subsists.

'But this circumstance is not insignificant. The salary furnishes to those who receive it a pretext and a means of opposing the efforts of all zeal *not* salaried; it confers on them, without any trouble of

theirs, an advantage of which the others cannot but complain; it gives them a superiority more or less considerable over all those who are compelled to commence with nothing; and though that superiority may be, in effect, far from conducing to the advantage of those who enjoy it, it is not the less unjust; the monopoly is chiefly injurious, indeed, to those who exercise it,—it is not the less odious. Thus stands the matter with those who receive the salary. For those who give it, it furnishes them with a right of interfering in affairs of a spiritual kind. How can we persuade the state that it is not its duty to overlook a service for which it pays? That would be without example and without analogy. . . . . Whosoever pays, is master; whosoever accepts payment, accepts servitude.

'Since we wrote these lines, the disputes in the Scottish church have occurred, to furnish a commentary on them. A quarrel has arisen between the paying and the receiving parties, the former claiming something in return for their aid, the latter wishing to give nothing. In this they are surely not in the wrong; their error is in receiving.

'. . . . If amongst these churches there is one which embraces the greater part of the nation, the state in its relations with her will be perpetually alternating caresses and menaces on account of the services which she may render, and the mischief she may inflict; and we shall see it sometimes penetrating within that foreign domain, intruding into the sanctuary, ... sometimes, on the same principle, flattering the intolerance and the passions of that church, and vexing, to please her, the communities which constitute the minority. For that church will in *her* turn require services; and the most useful, as most within the reach of *power*, is the persecution, at least indirect, of those sects which are odious to this church, which believes itself to be the church of the state, because it is that of the majority.

'A sagacious statesman seems to counsel government to remain strictly neuter, neither to require nor to render services. But the only guarantee of this neutrality is a *neutral position;* there is no other sure barrier against the abuse than a legal and material impossibility of being guilty of it. So long as *that* does not exist, the government, in spite of all experience, will act as it now acts. It will not have even the option of abstaining. The 'spiritual' and the 'temporal' thus confounded, will lead to disputes in which it will be necessary that it should interpose; and it is a consequence of a position so false, that once placed in it, or remaining in it, we *can* only commit mistakes. . . . . These results will cease only when the source of them shall fail. Then, and then alone, there will be but one people in the state, in spite of the diversities of worship; then will a perpetual cause of distrust and distraction in the body politic be for ever abolished; then, and not till then, will national unity be a *truth.*

'. . . . We have not proposed to ourselves the consideration of the question of the relations of church and state in all its bearings. Our subject invited us to treat it under one point of view, to which we have subordinated everything. It is as favourable and necessary to the manifestation of religious convictions, that we have maintained the

mutual independence of the two institutions. If they ask us, meantime, what may be called the *means* even of that *means*—if they wish to know in what way, in our opinion, the cancelling of a contract so burdensome to both parties may be effected, we will frankly avow our ignorance and our impotence. Liberty of all kinds may well be established gradually; . . . . but a principle once recognised, we cannot beforehand measure its march and count its steps; pronounce the right and the necessity entire, and yet concede for the hour only a *proportional* part of the necessity and the right. A right known is a right conquered. We may speak only half the truth, but that truth when it has been told, will not submit to be *realized* only by halves.'—pp. 412, *et seq.*

We heartily wish we could extend our quotations, and extract the animating passages in which our author exhorts those who have influence to use all the methods of peaceful agitation in their power, for the purpose of preparing and enlightening men's minds for a revolution in itself indeed inevitable, but which, like every other great revolution, can be happily and quietly effected only by laying the foundations deep in public opinion. Discussion—discussion—discussion—this is the only weapon which the Christian can employ, and the only one he can be willing to employ, but it is an all-effectual one. 'If they still ask us,' says our author, 'what are the means of accomplishing the object, we reply, they consist in doing, but more effectually, what we have just been attempting; they consist in the attempt to combine all the resources of reasoning, all the facts of history, all the truths of conscience, all the motives of religion to establish the truth, which we have sought to demonstrate. . . . . Neither *facts* alone—we may say it to our honour,—nor *principles* alone, —we may say it to our shame, will suffice for the establishment of truth in the world.'

The volume closes with a most touching prayer to Him from whom all 'holy desires' proceed, and who alone can render any efforts to serve him successful. We trust it will find a response in the heart of many a reader, and that the volume it so appropriately terminates may produce a wide effect throughout the nation in whose language it is written.

We are happy to see an announcement just put forth, that Professor Vinet's work is about to appear in an English translation.

Art. II. *Frederick the Great, his Court and Times.* Edited, with an Introduction, by Thomas Campbell, Esq., Author of the Pleasures of Hope. Vols. III. and IV. 1843. London: Colburn.

It will be in the recollection of our readers, that several months ago, when the two former volumes of this entertaining work appeared, we reviewed them at considerable length, and carried forward our sketch to the death of Frederick. We ventured to do this, not exactly knowing how soon, or how late, the sequel to Mr. Campbell's editorial labours might be permitted to amuse the public. There will be, therefore, no necessity to glance over again at the details of the Seven years' war, or analyze the policy of Prussia, as administered by her great military monarch to the very end of his days. We shall rather confine our remarks to two subjects, one of public and the other of private interest;—viz., the conduct of Frederick towards unhappy Poland; and the singularly erroneous ideas of his biographer with regard to the so-called religious opinions of the Philosopher of Sans Souci!

Now we believe, that there never was perpetrated any enormous crime in national annals, without some apology being made for it; nor has the most atrocious transgressor stalked over the stage of this world, provided only that he wore purple and fine linen, without finding some advocates, or at all events some intercessors. Even in the case of Nero himself, Suetonius tells us, *Et tamen non defuerunt qui per longum tempus vernis æstivisque floribus tumulum ejus ornarent!* It would seem, as though iniquity has but to attain an altitude and enormity sufficiently gigantic,—when immediately poor human nature, with her family of vices and bad passions, shall fall down before it, and worship the monstrous Titan. Frederick, surnamed by historical courtesy The Great, flattered, if not adored, by too many amongst his contemporaries, conceived, and partially exe cuted a scheme, for blotting out Poland from the map of Europe, upon the precise principles which actuated the virtuous Ahab, when he longed for Naboth's vineyard. He wanted to get rid of troublesome neighbours, and to aggrandize his power and territories; for which purposes, as he once jocosely confessed to the Grand Signor, when that potentate had requested from him the loan of a trio of astrologers, he kept about three such conjurors himself; their names being, Good Policy, Military Forces, and a Full Exchequer. With these mighty agents under his control, he, in fact, wrought all his enchantments; but what says his biographer?—'Here I would, once for all, direct the attention of the reader to the manly, frank, straight forward character of all Frederick's diplomatic transactions, totally at variance with

that petty, sneaking, underhand policy, with which superficial writers have not scrupled to charge the great king, especially in regard to the affairs of Poland.'—p. 343. And again, in page 300, of the fourth and same volume, it is asserted, that 'from the declarations of the king himself, as well as *from all accounts that can be depended on*, it is clear that Frederick was not the author of the first partition of Poland; that he acceded to it, because in so doing he avoided quarrels, and obtained, in a most convenient accession to his dominions, a compensation for the subsidies he had paid to Russia!' To Russia indeed! Was it common justice, on that account, to rob Poland? Had the marquisate of Brandenburgh been exhausted in defending the old kingdom of the Piasts, there might have been, at first sight, some apparent shadow of reason in this strange averment; at which, when we read it, we can only say that, like the Chinese Mandarins, quoted the other night by Lord Palmerston, we 'stared most indignantly.' The entire career of the conqueror of Silesia, degenerating as he did into the plunderer of Posen, can scarcely be said to be *adhuc sub judice lis*. History and public fame have pronounced sentence upon every portion of it. Insulated exceptions against their judgment may startle us, and even prove so far useful, that they lead us to look back and learn sorrowful lessons from what Von Müller denominates 'the morality of crowned heads.' But upon our author's own shewing, in various pages of the present work, we are content to stand or fall, as to there being impregnable grounds for the fullest condemnation of Frederick. We therefore proceed at once to a brief but plain statement of the facts of the matter.

Poland had flourished for five centuries as an absolute hereditary monarchy, under princes of the house of Piast, when that family unfortunately became extinct on the decease of Casimir the Great, about the year 1370. The people had acquired, by that time, some slight taste for legislation; whilst the university of Cracow, founded by Casimir, gleamed like a beacon amidst the receding darkness. His successor, the son of a sister, transmitted the Polish crown, through his daughter, Hedwig, to the Lithuanian Jagellon: from which circumstance, the kingdom attained fresh importance, in the possession of Dantzig and the enormous corn-trade of the Vistula. Another Casimir arose, who circumscribed the pretensions of the Teutonic Knights, wrested from them all Polish Prussia, and maintained a feudal superiority over the remainder. Polish Prussia meanwhile retained her own diets, her accustomed laws, her judicial forms, her own coinage, and the important right of suffrage in the regal elections. About the commencement of the sixteenth century, the Czars began to culminate. Smolenskow and

Pleskow had to be surrendered as the first fruits of subsequent spoliations. But Poland would have been able to keep at a respectful distance both the Russians and the Brandenburghers, had not the scorpion's egg been already laid in her own bosom. An aristocracy was rapidly hatching into vitality: ουκ αγαθη πολυκοιρανιη, εις κοιρανος εστω, εις βασιλευς! No future Frederick could have appropriated Posen, and disposed of its adjacent kingdoms and provinces, had the country proved but true to itself. The best sovereigns in the world could effect little against confederated nobles and magnates; as may be seen in another more favoured and powerful nation, in the instances of a bread monopoly. Sigismund was cutting down the Sarmatian forests, when his contemporary, Charles the Fifth, was gloating over dreams of universal monarchy. Poland grew enriched by the exportation of corn; but the state of bondage, as Von Müller observes, in which by far the greater part of the nation was held, prevented them from making any progress in the arts of civil life, or in the cultivation of the mental powers. Hence the rude productions of the country were exported in their unmanufactured state; all kinds of commerce were abandoned to the Jews; the principal enjoyments of life were those of the table. The court attempted in vain to produce permanent amelioration in the state of manners; a squadron of coronets laughed to scorn its endeavours, and trampled under the hoofs of their 200,000 mounted cavalry, the present liberties and future prosperity of a noble nation. The grandees, not satisfied with having rendered the sceptre an elective one, gradually deprived it of all substantial and useful authority. On the choice of every new king, some fresh innovation was introduced in their own favour, until at length the *Liberum Veto* came to be established, by which any member of the Diet could, by his single vote, throw the whole assembly and its proceedings into confusion. During the thirty years of Augustus II., every diet but one experienced this catastrophe; many of them, immediately after their opening, before any business of importance could come upon the carpet. On the death of Augustus III., the Polish chiefs offered the vacant crown to Prince Henry of Prussia, a proposal which Frederick declined, with exactly that species of ostentatious profession of moderation, which dishonesty displays, when conscious that more profitable schemes are behind the curtain. He would not for his existence accept what was proffered, where the national independence of a neighbouring state might seem to be violated! Such were his diplomatic professions; but let our readers mark 'the manly straightforward character of all his diplomatic transactions,' and as exhibited by the eulogistic biographer himself. In April, 1764, the Prussian monarch concluded a treaty with the Empress

Catherine; by which they agreed to oppose, by arms if necessary, any attempt on the part of others to interfere with Polish affairs; but 'in a secret convention concluded on the same day, both sovereigns agreed to place Count Stanislaus Poniatowsky on the throne.'—Vol. iv., p. 339. The peculiar situation of Frederick, observes our author, dictated at this precise moment the policy of not quarrelling with the Czarina; and therefore dust was to be thrown into the eyes of all Europe, whilst Frederick prepared to gratify his selfishness under the mask of extraordinary generosity. The arsenals of intrigue were to set in motion their choicest machinery. At Neisse and Neustadt the king had various interviews with the Emperor Joseph; and the following furnishes us with a fair specimen of the *manliness and straightforwardness* of royal and imperial diplomacy.

'One day, when the sovereigns were particularly confidential to each other, the conversation turned upon politics. 'Everybody,' said the king, 'cannot have the same system of politics; it must depend on the situation, the circumstances, and the power of each respective state; what might be advantageous to me might not suit your majesty. *I have sometimes risked a political falsehood.*' 'How was that?' asked the emperor, laughing. 'Why,' replied the king, also laughing, 'I have invented a piece of news, knowing that in four and twenty hours, it would be discovered to be false. I did not care for that, for before its falsehood was known, it had already produced its effect.'—Vol. iv., p. 350.

Without entering into the nicer points of military or political casuistry, we will only say, that after declarations of this kind, Frederick's disavowal of having projected a partition of Poland must go for very little indeed; for not an iota more than the denial of a common criminal arraigned at the Old Bailey. It was never suspected that his remorse of conscience could extort any genuine sacrifice of fame or popularity. He therefore merely rendered to virtue the villain's homage,—hypocrisy. Nor need we wonder at the notorious fact, that whilst the royal correspondent of Voltaire was expressing his abhorrence publicly of all Polish violation, a letter in cipher was intercepted and deciphered by Dumouriez, addressed to Stanislaus, whence it appeared that the very seizure in question had formed one of the main topics of discussion on the part of Frederick at Neustadt.

Prince Henry, the brother of Frederick, was now invited to St. Petersburgh. The empress there let fall an expression, that 'Poland seemed to be a country where one need but stoop,—to pick up something.' These ominous words met with a prompt interpreter in the party to whom they were addressed, and who reported them to Berlin with all imaginable rapidity. Nothing can be more clear than that the Czarina was revolving in her

mind some plan which the Prussian potentate had already suggested. 'In consequence of what had passed at Neustadt, he had written in September, 1770, to his ambassador in the Russian capital, that he had already submitted to Catherine a scheme for tranquillizing Poland, which to be palatable to the confederates, must be based on moderate principles.' Under cover of such unexceptionable propositions intended for public applause, his conduct the next year betrayed the genuine plot. 'Catherine,' says our biographer, 'reluctant as she might be to share with others what she would rather have kept to herself, yet entered into the further discussion of a plan of partition, and said with confidential frankness to Prince Henry, 'I will frighten the Turks and flatter the English; do you persuade Austria to lull France.' No sooner was it said than done. Frederick overwhelmed his brother with honours and revenues for the skilfulness displayed during these delicate negotiations. Troops, treasures, and artillery, were already organized and prepared. Upon the poor pretext of protection against pestilence, 'Prussia drew a military cordon, under General Billing, from Crossen to the other side of the Vistula.' The secret convention between the empress and Frederick for appropriating their respective portions of the spoil, was subscribed in February, 1772. Austria, under Maria Theresa, seems alone to have had any qualms upon the subject. Even when, within a month afterwards, she gave a reluctant assent, she wrote underneath it these honest sentiments:—'*Placet*, because so many great and learned men desire it; but long after I am dead, it will be seen what will result from this violation of all that has hitherto been regarded as sacred and just.' She had beforehand pressed her minister Kaunitz, with the warmest remonstrances. 'Indeed,' said she, 'I am ashamed to show my face. When claims were set up to all my dominions, and I knew not where I might lie in unmolested, I trusted to my own good right and the assistance of Almighty God. But in this matter, in which not only public right cries aloud to heaven against us, but equity and sound reason are both set at defiance by us, I must confess that never in my life have I felt such qualms of conscience. I am aware that I stand alone, and that I am no longer *en vigueur*. I therefore let things take their course, but not without the greatest chagrin.' Doctor Nares, the late Regius Professor of Modern History in Oxford, Wraxall, Russell, the late Lord Woodhouselee, none of them fairly liable to the charge of superficiality, together with the great mass of German and continental writers, fasten the prime guiltiness of the partition upon Prussia. One of the most extraordinary features, in the affair, is an effort on the part of our biographer to cite the celebrated historian of Switzerland as upon his side.

But all that is remarked by Von Müller, even in the passage quoted, amounts to these ambiguous palliatives,—'I am far from pretending to excuse what was done to the unfortunate Republic; but in a political point of view, most may be urged in favour of the king.' Whereby what he means merely amounts to this, as may be easily gathered from the context,—namely, that Frederick had most to gain by rounding the frontiers of his dominions, and that with regard to territory and population, he contented himself with the smallest share. His bribing the other two parties into the confederacy, was to secure a permanent European guarantee, both for his seizure of Silesia and his new Polish acquisitions. In other words, the royal philosopher of Sans Souci just consulted his three favourite astrologers, and acted upon their suggestions; the Swiss memorialist, meantime, having recorded the indignation of his own upright mind in 'thoughts that breathe, and words that burn.' The reproachful finger of indication, which his pages have turned upon the King of Prussia, will survive the Prussian monarchy, and go down through a long vista of ages after the shadow of its victim, to designate him as the Cain of modern policy. 'At length,' he observes, after portraying some instances of that oppression and craftiness with which the king endeavoured to screen his real criminality, 'on the 26th of September, 1772, and in the 1296th year, since a system of co-existent states began, after the destruction of the Western Empire, to be formed in Europe, the first important blow was given to the maxims and compacts on which their existence and the balance of their power had been gradually established.' He informs us, moreover, that Frederick had already collected tribute from the Vayvodeship of Great Poland, under pretence of compensation for expenses he conceived himself obliged to incur through the defective condition of the police in that country: 'but the compassion of mankind was excited, when he afterwards tore twelve thousand families from their native homes in order to populate his colonies in the Mark and in Pomerania. He proceeded to strike coins of silver and gold, *under the title of the king and republic of Poland, of far less than their nominal value,* and compelled all those from whom his subjects made purchases to take them in payment, while he refused to receive any other than the good old coin of the country for the stores which he accumulated. He oppressed commerce by the imposition of new duties, and gave occasion to the plundering or shutting up of the granaries of Poland, during a period of almost universal famine in Europe. The oppression and distress of Great Poland rose to such a height, that the people with their wives and children fled in troops towards the forest of Lithuania. Many perished under the hands of robbers, or died from ex-

haustion. The parents of the fugitives were fettered and ill-treated in their native country, because they could not prevent the emigration of their children; and those who had daughters were obliged to deliver up a certain number provided with portions for the Prussian colonies.' In all these details we are at a loss as to discerning aught else than the grossest tyranny and cruelty, whilst everything with regard to Poland, on the part of her persecutors in general, and of Frederick in particular, stands out in the picture as dark, 'petty, sneaking, and underhand.' The manifestoes published by his majesty on the occasion, furnish more than enough for conviction and condemnation; with regard to which, moreover, even our biographer cannot forbear observing, 'the public justification put forth by Frederick, related more especially to the country of Pomerellia, which had been wrested in the thirteenth century by the Poles from the Dukes of Pomerania; and as heir to that house, he insisted on his right to unite it to his dominions. The grave employment of such a plea *seems very much like adding insult to robbery.*'—Vol. iv., p. 357.

But what then, we would ask, becomes of all the eulogies on the great king touching the grandeur, disinterestedness, and magnanimity of his diplomatic policy? He blew loudly, from London and Paris, and Berlin, to Vienna, the trumpet of his own praises, 'about his well known goodness and moderation,' virtues which, wherever they really exist, can thoroughly afford to be silent. Not so, however, thinks a wounded conscience, tossing upon its bed of inward torment, except when drugged by the most potent opiates of infidelity. Royal deeds belied both pretexts and promises. He continued to raise the tolls in the harbour of Dantzig to an intolerable height; and the city was urged by all possible means to surrender itself voluntarily to his sway. He summoned a diet at Lissa to counteract that of Warsaw, and confiscated the estates of all such nobles as refused allegiance. The whole of Polish Prussia had been embraced within his toils, together with the districts of the Netz, whereby his kingdom became a continuous territory from Glatz to Memel. He acquired the fertile provinces of Culm, Elbing, and Marienburgh, besides rendering himself master of the cathedral of Wermeland, with an annual revenue of 300,000 dollars, and of the only mouths of the Vistula yet remaining navigable. So hastily, however, in some instances, had the vultures rushed down upon the carcase, that even Prussia found herself compelled to disgorge; yet wherever any temporary possessions were relinquished by Frederick, he first had the flocks driven away, the forests cut down, the magazines emptied, even the most necessary implements carried off, and the taxes raised by anticipation. We

appeal to the cited historian for a verification of every tittle of these charges. The footsteps of Prussian spoliation might be said to have realized the boast of Attila, that where his horse had trodden, grass would never grow. We admit that royal robbery, when it had glutted its appetite and grown wiser, sought a selfish compensation for military losses in multifarious efforts after a better sort of civilization. Yet the calls of common justice compel us to enter our protest against a reversal of that historical verdict, which the truthfulness and general assent of mankind have recorded against a mighty transgressor, whose delinquencies must never be forgotten or varnished over on the one hand, nor the transcendent character of his genius, as a general and a sovereign *over his native subjects*, omitted or underrated on the other. In proportion to our admiration of the volumes before us, is our anxiety to remove from them every blemish, as well from a warm respect towards their gifted editor, as a regard for our own usefulness and consistency as responsible reviewers.

But we must now advert to another matter, not altogether of such public concern or sympathy, perhaps, as the rapacity of Frederick with regard to Poland; we allude to his irreligious principles. True enough it may be, that to God alone is man to give an account of those spiritual and mysterious movements of mind, which constitute the inner world in each individual; but the King of Prussia courted observation as to everything connected with himself; and he gloried in his discipleship towards Voltaire, even when he had experienced the treachery and profligacy of the latter, almost more than in his victories and laws. It is with much regret that we animadvert upon the extremely defective statements and impressions brought before our readers, in these volumes, with respect to the notorious infidelity of their hero. That the conqueror of Silesia has often been characterized as 'a downright Atheist, wholly devoid of religious sentiments of any kind,—a disbeliever in the existence of a God, and consequently of the immortality of the soul,' is no doubt correct; nor is it less so, that in logical strictness of expression, such heavy and unguarded inculpations cannot very easily be proved. Yet they are surely not a whit more injudicious than puerile and wretched generalities like the following:

'From the year 1736, when Frederick corresponded with Suhm and Voltaire, and conversed with Beausobre and Achard, the protestant divines, on religious topics, to the end of his life, inquiries concerning the Infinite were dear to his heart, and a favourite pursuit of his strong understanding. He not only believed *with full and profound conviction the existence of God, but defended it with zeal; he sought in pure morality the cheerful enjoyment of life; he consoled himself and others with the soothing doctrine of a future state; he maintained, with clo-*

quent pen, the excellence of Christianity against its slanderers: and that he was a stanch protestant he proved, indeed not without prejudice to his catholic subjects. He seems to have early adopted in practice the sentiments expressed by Pope—

> 'For modes of faith let graceless zealots fight,—
> He can't be wrong, whose life is in the right.'

What is this, indeed, but the doctrine inculcated by the great Founder of Christianity himself, in his sermon on the Mount, in the words, 'By their fruits shall ye know them;' and again, 'Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father, which is in heaven.' May we not almost infer from these passages, that the best men must have the best religion,—and that he worships God in the greatest purity who strives most to imitate Him! As sovereign, it was a law with Frederick *never to be weary of well doing;* and with such a profession he did not deviate widely from the church, to which his theoretical convictions also approached nearer than many a one, not sufficiently informed on the subject, may conceive.'—Vol. iv., pp. 128, 129.

We felt reminded, on reading this and similar passages, of all those sagacious old *saws*,—'the further from church the nearer to God,' and the like,—in which our ancestors, or at least many of them, thought they discerned abysses of wisdom and knowledge. Were the topic not too serious a one to excite smiles upon, we might rank our biographer, in religious matters, with such profound divines as Richard Brinsley Sheridan, who once quoted Moses as the author of that solemn scripture, 'Evil communications corrupt good manners;' or, an existing and well-known canon residentiary of St. Paul's, who, in a published sermon on the accession of her present Majesty, concluded with the *words of the blessed Psalmist*, 'Lord! now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace!' We have ventured to throw a few of our biographer's statements into italics, that ordinary people, like ourselves, may read them, so as to be quite certain that our eyes are in their proper places!

In sober sadness, the full and profound religious convictions of Frederick the Great, his eloquent defence of Christianity, his realization of pure morality, his soothing confidence in the verities of a future state, his zealous championship against their impugners, the supposed believer in nothing but the French Encyclopædia, being, under the rose, a genuine apostle of the gospel, if not a positive son of consolation, and himself 'never weary of well-doing,'—we declare all these most preposterous assertions have given us the heart-ache! They affectingly force upon our attention the inspired description of this world and its multitude of wise men; professing themselves to be such, they become

fools! Under their hands, words of truth degenerate into empty sounds. Religion, instead of being dealt with as a matter of the heart, comes to signify nothing more than a congeries of vapid speculations. Without form and void, it eludes the observer as an inanity only less solid than a shadow—*dat sine mente sonum!* Now, just let us take the vaunted religious convictions of Frederick, and see what in plain fact they amount to, even as represented by our biographer, in other portions of his work, when it must have slipped his memory, that he had imposed upon himself the superhuman labour of trying to wash white a Blackamoor! In conversation with Professor Sulzer, in 1777, he thus scoffingly described the Holy Trinity, saying that 'Among other things, people had carried absurdity to such a length, as to assume the existence of a God, who had produced a second, and those two had made a third between them!' (Vol. iv., p. 131.) D'Alembert could write to Voltaire that he and his friends only hated superstition, 'whilst they reverenced both Christianity and its founder:' *Credat Judæus!* Frederick also varnished over his infidelity with the same French polish of lies; but could so astute an author, as the one now before us, be misled by a few idle professions? In his epistle on the death of Marshal Saxe, he directly impugns the immortality of the soul, and all real notions of a future state. We use the term *real*, because occasional allusions in subsequent or previous works, to the elysium of mythology and poetry, were upon the face of them no more than mere flights of the pen—the unsubstantial imagery of a conceited sovereign, proud of having condescended to study the classics, like ordinary scholars. But even his present memorialist naively mentions that, 'it is a fact, that he wrote to d'Alembert, in 1780, that he had no conception of an immortal soul.' One day, a member of the academy was stating a long series of reasons, on behalf of future existence and accountability, when Frederick cut him short, 'What!' said he, 'do you want to be immortal?' He often ridiculed what he termed the 'day-dreams sweet of immortality;' as he also told d'Alembert, 'I approach the term of my career, enjoying the present without fearing the future. What terrors, indeed, *can there be after death?* If body and soul are doomed to expire together, I shall return to the bosom of the earth, and mingle with it; but *if a spark of my mind exists after death*, into the arms of my God will I betake me.' (Vol. iv., p. 136.) And these are what his biographer affects to call his hero's religious convictions! No people in the world can be more sentimental, on certain occasions, than confirmed sceptics. When the news was brought the King of Prussia that his favourite sister, the

Margravine of Bayreuth had departed, his majesty composed a sermon upon some text of scripture applicable to his situation, which he handed to Le Cat, written upon a roll of black-edged paper. After the defeat at Hochkirk, he was found studying the discourses of Pere de Bourdaloue in the evening. 'Behold,' says his eulogist, 'what a religious monarch!' Yet when we proceed a little further, whilst the same Le Cat endeavours to cheer his master, 'the latter assured him, that *he had always something at hand to put an end to the tragedy!* In which words, *he alluded to the poison*, in the form of pills, which he carried about him, to be used in the last extremity, especially in case he had chanced to be taken prisoner.' (Vol. iii., p. 207.) On the 28th October, 1760, in a letter to d'Argens, he expresses, without reserve, his determination to destroy himself, should he fail in certain military measures; and with regard to this letter, we are at a loss for words to express our abhorrence of the following sentence deliberately propounded by our author:—

'The right royal sentiments thus uttered by Frederick, convince me, *that a monarch like him is not to be measured on this point by the same standard as ordinary men in humbler stations;* and that *self-murder* may be in some rare cases not only an excusable, but even a commendable act,—nay, *an act of the highest public virtue.*'—Vol. iii., p. 310.

Alas! for the 'pure morality in which he sought the cheerful enjoyment of life;' it stood upon about as firm a foundation as his religious convictions. Are we to see it illustrated in his conduct towards his virtuous queen, who had never offended him, but whom he treated with the most cruel politeness and the most insulting neglect? Was his defence of political falsehood moral, or the contrary? Were his actions respecting Silesia and Poland pure and upright, or tyrannical and dishonourable? Were his bitter hatred and persecution of the son of the celebrated founder of the Orphan House at Halle, on the score of his being what the king called a 'pietistical mucker,' (a term of detestable contempt applied by Frederick as our bishops used to handle the epithet, *methodist*,) or was his universal acrimony towards all individuals wearing the garb of clergymen, whether catholic or protestant,—we would ask, did all this savour of Christian championship, or Christian temper, or anything consistent even with Christian, not to say intellectual liberality? Or are such observations as these seemly, when describing the death-bed scene of the friend of Voltaire? 'Frederick needed no propitiatory prayers, no priestly intercessions, no exercises of penance to appease the wrath of an all-righteous

judge. His work was accomplished; he had done good in his generation, and he quitted the world lonely, calmly, free from cares, free from stings of conscience, although sensible till a few moments before his death.' His last will betrays the genuine creed of the royal philosopher, in full accordance with what we must designate as German and Gallican heathenism: 'I give back cheerfully and without regret this breath of life to bounteous nature, who bestowed it upon me; my body also to the elements of which it is composed!' But we have perhaps already said more than enough upon a subject so painful, and therefore we content ourselves with transcribing an anecdote which has not happened to come across us before:—

'On the partition of Poland, when the king took possession of his share, the catholic bishop of Ermeland lost a considerable portion of his revenues. When, soon after, he waited on the king at Potsdam, Frederick said to him, 'Surely you cannot feel any attachment to me.' The bishop replied, that he should never forget the duty which a subject owes to his sovereign. 'And I,' rejoined the king, 'am your very good friend, and reckon with confidence on your friendship. If St. Peter should deny me admittance into Paradise, I hope you will do me the favour to smuggle me in under your cloak.' 'That will scarcely be possible,' said the bishop, 'for your majesty has clipped it so short, that there would be little chance of hiding any contraband goods under it.' '—Vol. iv. p. 223.

Having thus recorded our candid opinions on what we consider highly reprehensible in both Frederick and his biographer, we have to thank the spirited publisher of these volumes for having favoured us with a full-length portrait of the famous King of Prussia, which, but for his energetic liberality, would most probably never have appeared in an English dress. Their editor, we humbly conceive, was bound to have stated his dissent from particular statements, paragraphs, and impressions. It strikes us that he is still bound to do so, both with regard to the chapter upon Poland, and the scepticism of her spoiler. Has the poet of the 'Pleasures of Hope, forgotten the glorious strains of his earlier days?

'Oh! bloodiest picture in the book of time,
When Poland fell, unwept, without a crime!
Without one generous friend, or pitying foe,
Strength in her arms, or mercy in her woe!
Dropt from her nerveless grasp the shatter'd spear,
Closed her bright eye, and curb'd her high career:
Hope, for a season, bade the world farewell,
And freedom shrieked, as Kosciusko fell!

There live, alas! of heaven-directed mien,
Of cultured soul, and sapient eye serene,
Who hail thee, man, the pilgrim of a day,
Spouse of the worm, and brother of the clay!
Frail as the leaf in autumn's yellow bower,
Dust in the wind, or dew upon the flower.
A friendless slave, a child without a sire,
Whose mortal life and momentary fire,
Light to the grave, his chance-created form
As ocean-wrecks illuminate the storm;
And when the gun's tremendous flash is o'er,
To night and silence sink for evermore!'

Art. III. *Life in Mexico during a Residence of Two Years in that Country.* By Madame C—— de la B——. *With a Preface* by W. H. Prescott. 8vo. London: Chapman and Hall.

This volume is introduced to public confidence by Mr. Prescott, the author of 'The History of Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain,' who assures us that it is 'the result of observations made during a two years' residence in Mexico by a lady whose position there made her intimately acquainted with its Society, and opened to her the best sources of information in regard to whatever could interest an enlightened foreigner.'

It is the production of Madame Calderon de la Barca, the wife of a Spanish ambassador, and consists of letters written to the members of her family, without, as we are informed, the remotest idea of publication. 'Feeling a regret,' says Mr. Prescott, 'that such rich stores of instruction and amusement, from which I had so much profited myself, should be reserved for the eyes of a few friends only, I strongly recommended that they should be given to the world.' In this he acted most wisely, and we thank him for his counsel, and rejoice that it was adopted. We have seldom read a volume containing a richer fund of entertaining information set forth in a style at once lively and pointed, rapid in its sketches, and picturesque in its general grouping.

Madame Calderon, in company with her husband, left New York in the packet-ship Norma, on the 27th October, 1839, and entered the beautiful bay of Havana on the 12th of the following month. 'Everything,' she says, 'struck us as strange and picturesque. The soldiers of the garrison, the prison built by General Tacon, the irregular houses, with their fronts painted red or pale blue, and with the cool but uninhabited look produced by the absence of glass windows, the merchant ships

and large men of war, vessels from every port in the commercial world, the little boats gliding amongst them with their snow white sails, the negroes on the wharf—nothing European; the heat was great, that of a July day, without any freshness in the air.' The fashions of the old country were found to prevail in its distant colony,—the aristocracy calling each other by their Christian name, and those of an inferior rank being known by the more punctilious observance of external respect towards them. The following brief passage affords a glimpse of Havana Society, which is not without its interest:—

'Of course, I could not leave Havana without devoting one morning to shopping. The shops have most seducing names—Hope, Wonder, Desire, &c. The French modistes seem to be wisely improving their time, by charging respectable prices for their work. The shopkeepers bring their goods out to the volante, it not being the fashion for ladies to enter the shops, though I took the privilege of a foreigner to infringe this rule occasionally. Silks and satins very dear—lace and muslin very reasonable, was, upon the whole, the result of my investigation; but as it only lasted two hours, and that my sole purchases of any consequence were an indispensable mantilla, and a pair of earrings, I give my opinion for the present with due diffidence.

'I can speak with more decision on the subject of a great ball given us by the Countess F——a, last evening, which was really superb. The whole house was thrown open—there was a splendid supper, quantities of refreshments, and the whole select aristocracy of Havana. Diamonds on all the women, jewels and orders on all the men, magnificent lustres and mirrors, and a capital band of music in the gallery.

'The Captain-General was the only individual in a plain dress. He made himself very agreeable, in good French. About one hundred couple stood up in each country-dance, but the rooms are so large and so judiciously lighted, that we did not feel at all warm. Waltzes, quadrilles, and these long Spanish dances, succeeded each other. Almost all the girls have fine eyes and beautiful figures, but without colour, or much animation. The finest diamonds were those of the Countess F——a, particularly her necklace, which was *undeniable*.

'Walking through the rooms after supper, we were amused to see the negroes and negresses helping themselves plentifully to the sweatmeats, uncorking and drinking fresh bottles of Champagne, and devouring everything on the supper tables, without the slightest concern for the presence either of their master or mistress; in fact, behaving like a multitude of spoilt children, who are sure of meeting with indulgence, and presume upon it. * * *

'Towards morning we were led down stairs to a large suite of rooms, containing a library of several thousand volumes, where coffee, cakes, &c., were prepared in beautiful Sévres porcelain and gold plate. We left the house, at last, to the music of the national hymn

of Spain, which struck up as we passed through the gallery.'—pp. 13, 14.

From Havana, our author proceeded in the Jason, a Spanish ship of war, to Vera Cruz, of which she informs us that 'anything more melancholy, *délabré*, and forlorn than the whole appearance of things as we drew near, cannot well be imagined.' In the course of her walks in the environs of this miserable city, she fell in with a singular exemplification of the state of society, at which many of our fair readers will, doubtless, be greatly shocked. We are gallant enough to believe that the custom referred to must belong to 'the olden time;' nevertheless, we will record it for the amusement, if not the guidance of our young friends. Madame Calderon says, 'We walked in the direction of an old church, where it is, or was the custom for young ladies desirous of being married to throw a stone at the saint, their fortune depending upon the stone's hitting him, so that he is in a lapidated and dilapidated condition.'

The travellers left Vera Cruz early on the morning of the 23rd of December, and halted to breakfast at Manga de Clavo, the residence of Santa Anna, the ex-president, whose appearance and manners are thus described:—

'In a little while entered General Santa Anna himself, a gentlemanly, good-looking, quietly-dressed, rather melancholy-looking person, with one leg, apparently somewhat of an invalid, and to us the most interesting person in the group. He has a sallow complexion, fine dark eyes, soft and penetrating, and an interesting expression of face. Knowing nothing of his past history, one would have said—a philosopher, living in dignified retirement, one who had tried the world, and found that all was vanity, one who had suffered ingratitude, and who, if he were ever persuaded to emerge from his retreat, would only do so, Cincinnatus-like, to benefit his country. It is strange how frequently this expression of philosophic resignation, of placid sadness, is to be remarked on the countenances of the deepest, most ambitious, and most designing men. C——n gave him a letter from the Queen, written under the supposition of his being still President, with which he seemed much pleased, but merely made the innocent observation, 'How very well the Queen writes!'

'It was only now and then that the expression of his eye was startling, especially when he spoke of his leg, which is cut off below the knee. He speaks of it frequently, like Sir John Ramorny of his bloody hand, and when he gives an account of his wound, and alludes to the French on that day, his countenance assumes that air of bitterness which Ramorny's may have exhibited when speaking of 'Harry the Smith.'

'Otherwise, he made himself very agreeable, spoke a great deal of the United States, and of the persons he had known there, and in his manners was quiet and gentlemanlike, and altogether a more polished

hero than I had expected to see. To judge from the past, he will not long remain in his present state of inaction, besides having within him, according to Zavala, 'a principle of action for ever impelling him forward.'—p. 27.

The general appearance of the country formed a striking contrast to the neighbourhood of Vera Cruz, and would appear, from our author's account, to be highly picturesque and beautiful :—

'It was difficult to believe, as we journeyed on, that we were now in the midst of December. The air was soft and balmy. The heat, without being oppressive, that of a July day in England. The road through a succession of woody country; trees covered with every variety of blossom, and loaded with the most delicious tropical fruits; flowers of every colour filling the air with fragrance, and the most fantastical profusion of parasitical plants intertwining the branches of the trees, and flinging their bright blossoms over every bough. Palms, cocoas, oranges, lemons, succeeded one another, and at one turn of the road, down in a lovely green valley, we caught a glimpse of an Indian woman, with her long hair, resting under the shade of a lofty tree, beside a running stream—an Oriental picture. Had it not been for the dust and the jolting, nothing could have been more delightful.'—p. 29.

In a subsequent part of the journey the scenery is represented as 'wild and grand, yet dreary and monotonous, . . . the only signs of life to be met with being the long strings of arrieros with their droves of mules, and an occasional Indian hut, with a few miserable half-naked women and children.' The great object of interest was Mexico, the ancient capital of Montezuma, the distant view of which is thus described :—

'At length we arrived at the heights looking down upon the great valley, celebrated in all parts of the world, with its framework of everlasting mountains, its snow-crowned volcanoes, great lakes, and fertile plains, all surrounding the favoured city of Montezuma, the proudest boast of his conqueror, once of Spain's many diadems the brightest. But the day had overcast, nor is this the most favourable road for entering Mexico. The innumerable spires of the distant city were faintly seen. The volcanoes were enveloped in clouds, all but their snowy summits, which seemed like marble domes towering into the sky. But as we strained our eyes to look into the valley, it all appeared to me rather like a vision of the past than the actual breathing present. The curtain of Time seemed to roll back and to discover to us the great panorama that burst upon the eye of Cortes when he first looked down upon the table-land; the king-loving, God-fearing conqueror, his loyalty and religion so blended after the fashion of ancient Spain, that it were hard to say which sentiment exercised over him the greater sway. The city of Tenochtitlan, standing in the midst of the five great lakes, upon verdant and flower-covered

islands, a western Venice, with thousands of boats gliding swiftly along its streets, long lines of low houses, diversified by the multitudes of pyramidal temples, the Teocalli, or houses of God—canoes covering the mirrored lakes—the lofty trees, the flowers, and the profusion of water now wanting to the landscape—the whole fertile valley enclosed by its eternal hills and snow-crowned volcanoes—what scenes of wonder and of beauty to burst upon the eyes of these wayfaring men!

'Then the beautiful gardens surrounding the city, the profusion of flowers, and fruit, and birds—the mild bronze-coloured Emperor himself advancing in the midst of his Indian nobility, with rich dress and unshod feet, to receive his unbidden and unwelcome guest—the slaves and the gold and the rich plumes, all to be laid at the feet of 'His most sacred Majesty'—what pictures are called up by the recollection of the simple narrative of Cortes, and how forcibly they return to the mind now, when, after a lapse of three centuries, we behold, for the first time, the city of palaces raised upon the ruins of the Indian capital.'—pp. 39, 40.

The ambassador was received with great honour, a military escort being in attendance, together with 'a very splendid carriage, all crimson and gold.' Once arrived in the capital, Madame Calderon had ample opportunities of noticing the manners and social habits of the higher classes. Her official position, and the peaceful character of her husband's mission, led to her company being solicited on all hands, so that she was perpetually in society, and saw the bright side of everything. It is a point of established etiquette in Mexico, that all new comers, whatever their rank or station, must give printed notice to every family of distinction, of their arrival. An influx of visitors is the natural consequence of this custom, and many of our readers will be surprised at the easy familiarity which is at once established, and the duration of the visits which are paid. Madame Calderon says—

'Some Mexican visits appear to me to surpass in duration all that one can imagine of a visit, rarely lasting less than one hour, and sometimes extending over a great part of the day. And gentlemen, at least, arrive at no particular time. If you are going to breakfast, they go also—if to dinner, the same—if you are asleep, they wait till you awaken — if out, they call again. An indifferent sort of man, whose name I did not even hear, arrived yesterday a little after breakfast, sat still, and walked in to a late dinner with us! These should not be called visits, but visitations, though I trust they do not often occur to that extent. An open house and an open table for your friends, which includes every passing acquaintance; these are merely Spanish habits of hospitality transplanted.'—p. 43.

Our fair author returned, of course, these visits, in the course of which the following incident occurred, which throws a sombre

light on the prevalence of superstition amongst the gay and light-hearted Mexicans :—

'I paid a visit the other day, which merits to be recorded. It was to the rich Senora ——, whose first visit I had not yet returned. She was at home, and I was shown into a very large drawing-room, where, to my surprise, I found the lamps, mirrors, &c., covered with black crape, as in cases of mourning here. I concluded that some one of the family was dead, and that I had made a very ill-timed first visit. However, I sat down, when my eyes were instantly attracted by *something awful* placed directly in front of the sofa where I sat. There were six chairs ranged together, and on these lay, stretched out, a figure, apparently a dead body, about six feet long, enveloped in black cloth, the feet alone visible, from their pushing up the cloth. Oh, horror! Here I sat, my eyes fixed upon this mysterious apparition, and lost in conjecture as to whose body it might be. The master of the house? He was very tall, and being in bad health, might have died suddenly. My being received argued nothing against this, since the first nine days after a death, the house is invariably crowded with friends and acquaintances, and the widow, or orphan, or childless mother, must receive the condolences of all and sundry, in the midst of her first bitter sorrow. There seems to be no idea of grief wishing for solitude.

'Pending these reflections, I sat uneasily, feeling or fancying a heavy air in the apartment, and wishing, most sincerely, that some living person would enter. I thought even of slipping away, but feared to give offence, and in fact began to grow so nervous, that when the Senora de —— entered at length, I started up as if I had heard a pistol. She wore a coloured muslin gown and a blue shawl; no signs of mourning!

'After the usual complimentary preface, I asked particularly after her husband, keeping a side glance on the mysterious figure. He was pretty well. Her family? Just recovered from the smallpox, after being severely ill. 'Not dangerously?' said I, hesitatingly, thinking she might have *a tall son*, and that she alluded to the recovery of the others. 'No;' but her sister's children had been alarmingly ill. 'Not *lost* any, I hope?' 'None.' Well, so taken up was I, that conversation flagged, and I answered and asked questions at random, until, at last, I happened to ask the lady if she were going to the country soon. 'Not to remain. But to-morrow we are going to convey a *Santo Cristo* (a figure of the crucifixion) there, which has just been made for the chapel;' glancing towards the figure; 'for which reason this room is, as you see, hung with black.' I never felt so relieved in my life, and thought of the Mysteries of Udolpho.'—pp. 94, 95.

No person, of course, could visit Mexico without attending the *bull-fight*, a national pastime at once disgraceful and brutalizing. The Spaniards are accustomed to it, but Madame Calderon

had not seen the magnificent arena of Madrid, and therefore describes the scene with all the freshness of novelty:—

'Fancy an immense amphitheatre, with four great tiers of boxes, and a range of uncovered seats in front, the whole crowded almost to suffocation; the boxes filled with ladies in full dress, and the seats below by gaily-dressed and most enthusiastic spectators; two military bands of music, playing beautiful airs from the operas; an extraordinary variety of brilliant costumes, all lighted up by the eternally deep blue sky; ladies and peasants, and officers in full uniform, and you may conceive that it must have been altogether a varied and curious spectacle.

'About half-past six a flourish of trumpets announced the president, who came in uniform with his staff, and took his seat to the music of 'Guerra! Guerra! I bellici trombi.' Shortly after the matadors and picadors, the former on foot, the latter on horseback, made their entry, saluting all round the arena, and were received with loud cheering.

'Bernardo's dress of blue and silver was very superb, and cost him five hundred dollars. The signal was given—the gates were thrown open, and a bull sprang into the arena; not a great, fierce-looking animal, as they are in Spain, but a small, angry, wild-looking beast, with a troubled eye.

'That first *pose* of the bull is superb! Pasta, in her Medea, did not surpass it. Meanwhile, the matadors and the *banderilleros* shook their coloured scarfs at him—the picadors poked at him with their lances. He rushed at the first, and tossed up the scarfs which they threw at him, while they sprung over the arena; galloped after the others, striking the horses, so that along with their riders they occasionally rolled in the dust; both, however, almost instantly recovering their equilibrium, in which there is no time to be lost. Then the matadors would throw fireworks, crackers adorned with streaming ribbons, which stuck on his horns, and as he tossed his head, enveloped him in a blaze of fire. Occasionally the picador would catch hold of the bull's tail, and passing it under his own right leg, wheel his horse round, force the bullock to gallop backwards, and throw him on his face.

'Maddened with pain, streaming with blood, stuck full of darts, and covered with fireworks, the unfortunate beast went galloping round and round, plunging blindly at man and horse, and frequently trying to leap the barrier, but driven back by the waving hats and shouting of the crowd. At last, as he stood at bay, and nearly exhausted, the matador ran up and gave him the mortal blow, considered a peculiar proof of skill. The bull stopped, as if he felt that his hour were come, staggered, made a few plunges at nothing, and fell. A finishing stroke, and the bull expired.

'The trumpets sounded, the music played. Four horses galloped in tied to a yoke, to which the bull was fastened, and swiftly dragged out of the arena. This last part had a fine effect, reminding one of a Roman sacrifice. In a similar manner, eight bulls were done to death.

The scene is altogether fine, the address amusing, but the wounding and tormenting of the bull is sickening, and as here the tips of his horns are blunted, one has more sympathy with him than with his human adversaries. It cannot be good to accustom a people to such bloody sights.

'Yet let me confess, that though at first I covered my face and could not look, little by little I grew so much interested in the scene, that I could not take my eyes off it, and I can easily understand the pleasure taken in these barbarous diversions, by those accustomed to them from childhood.'—pp. 64, 65.

Speaking of the appearance and habits of the Mexican ladies, our fair author notes the general absence of personal beauty, which, however, she charitably attributes mainly to the absence of colour. Their morning dress is also distinguished by great carelessness, though the indolence which has led to this is said to be going out of fashion. Their houses, however, are 'the perfection of cleanliness,' which, considering the enormous size of Mexican dwellings, is both matter of surprise and greatly to their credit. Caps are never worn, even by the oldest, 'their own grey hair, sometimes cut short, sometimes turned up with a comb, and not unusually tied behind in a pigtail,' being ever visible. The following exhibits a trait of social life, strikingly in contrast with something which may be seen nearer home:—

'It appears to me, that amongst the young girls here there is not that desire to enter upon the cares of matrimony, which is to be observed in many other countries. The opprobrious epithet of 'old maid' is unknown. A girl is not the less admired because she has been ten or a dozen years in society; the most severe remark made on her is that she is 'hard to please.' No one calls her *passée*, or looks out for a new face to admire. I have seen no courting of the young men either in mothers or daughters; no match-making mammas, or daughters looking out for their own interests. In fact, young people have so few opportunities of being together, that Mexican marriages must be made in heaven, for I see no opportunity of bringing them about upon earth! The young men, when they do meet with young ladies in society, appear devoted to and very much afraid of them. I know but one lady in Mexico who has the reputation of having manœuvred all her daughters into great marriages; but she is so clever, and her daughters were such beauties, that it can have cost her no trouble. As for flirtation, the name is unknown, and the thing.'—pp. 132, 133.

Other modes, however,—not less exceptionable, certainly—are resorted to, in order to dispose of such of the younger women as might prove an incumbrance on their families. Superstition comes in aid of the unnatural device, and the result is as might be expected, fraught with incalculable wretchedness. Madame Calderon was present on three occasions of nuns taking the veil,

and considers it, 'next to a death, the saddest event that can occur in this nether sphere.' We shall transcribe her account of one of these ceremonies, simply premising that the nun was of a distinguished family, and that Madame Calderon had been invited by her mother to be present on the occasion.

'I called at the house, was shown up stairs, and to my horror, found myself in the midst of a 'goodlie companie,' in rich array, consisting of the relations of the family, to the number of about a hundred persons; the bishop himself in his purple robes and amethysts, a number of priests, the father of the young lady in his general's uniform; she herself in purple velvet, with diamonds and pearls, and a crown of flowers; the *corsage* of her gown entirely covered with little bows of ribbon of divers colours, which her friends had given her, each adding one, like stones thrown on a cairn in memory of the departed. She had also short sleeves and white satin shoes.

'Being very handsome, with fine black eyes, good teeth, and fresh colour, and above all with the beauty of youth, for she is but eighteen, she was not disfigured even by this overloaded dress. Her mother, on the contrary, who was to act the part of Madrina, who wore a dress fac-simile, and who was pale and sad, her eyes almost extinguished with weeping, looked like a picture of misery in a ball-dress. In the adjoining room, long tables were laid out, on which servants were placing refreshments for the fête about to be given on the joyous occasion. I felt somewhat shocked, and inclined to say with Paul Pry, 'Hope I don't intrude.' But my apologies were instantly cut short, and I was welcomed with true Mexican hospitality; repeatedly thanked for my kindness in coming to see the nun, and hospitably pressed to join the family feast. I only got off upon a promise of returning at half-past five to accompany them to the ceremony, which, in fact, I greatly preferred to going there alone.

'I arrived at the hour appointed, and being led up stairs by the Senator Don —— ——, found the morning party, with many additions, lingering over the dessert. There was some gaiety, but evidently forced. It reminded me of a marriage feast previous to the departure of the bride, who is about to be separated from her family for the first time. Yet how different in fact this banquet, where the mother and daughter met together for the last time on earth!

'At stated periods, indeed, the mother may hear her daughter's voice speaking to her as from the depths of the tomb; but she may never more fold her in her arms, never more share in her joys or in her sorrows, or nurse her in sickness; and when her own last hour arrives, though but a few streets divide them, she may not give her dying blessing to the child who has been for so many years the pride of her eyes and heart.

'——, however, was furious at the whole affair, which he said was entirely against the mother's consent, though that of the father had been obtained; and pointed out to me the confessor whose influence had brought it about. The girl herself was now very pale, but evi-

dently resolved to conceal her agitation, and the mother seemed as if she could shed no more tears—quite exhausted with weeping. As the hour for the ceremony drew near, the whole party became more grave and sad, all but the priests, who were smiling and talking together in groups. The girl was not still a moment. She kept walking hastily through the house, taking leave of the servants, and naming probably her last wishes about everything. She was followed by her younger sisters, all in tears.

'But it struck six, and the priests intimated that it was time to move. She and her mother went down stairs alone, and entered the carriage which was to drive them through all the principal streets, to show the nun to the public according to custom, and to let them take their last look, they of her, and she of them. As they got in, we all crowded to the balconies to see her take leave of her house, her aunts saying, 'Yes, child, *despidete de tu casa*—take leave of your house, you will never see it again!' Then came sobs from the sisters, and many of the gentlemen, ashamed of their emotion, hastily quitted the room. I hope, for the sake of humanity, I did not rightly interpret the look of constrained anguish which the poor girl threw from the window of the carriage at the home of her childhood.

'They drove off, and the relations prepared to walk in procession to the church. I walked with the Count S——o, the others followed in pairs. The church was very brilliantly illuminated, and as we entered, the band was playing one of *Strauss's* waltzes! The crowd was so tremendous that we were nearly squeezed to a jelly in getting to our places. I was carried off my feet between two fat Senoras in mantillas and shaking diamond pendants, exactly as if I had been packed between two movable feather-beds.

'They gave me, however, an excellent place, quite close to the grating, beside the Countess de S——o, that is to say, a place to kneel on. A great bustle and much preparation seemed to be going on within the convent, and veiled figures were flitting about, whispering, arranging, &c. Sometimes a skinny old dame would come close to the grating, and lifting up her veil, bestow upon the pensive public a generous view of a very haughty and very wrinkled visage of some seventy years standing, and beckon into the church for the major-domo of the convent, (an excellent and profitable situation by the way,) or for padre this or that. Some of the holy ladies recognised and spoke to me through the grating.

'But at the discharge of fireworks outside the church the curtain was dropped, for this was the signal that the nun and her mother had arrived. An opening was made in the crowd as they passed into the church; and the girl, kneeling down, was questioned by the bishop, but I could not make out the dialogue, which was carried on in a low voice. She then passed into the convent by a side door, and her mother, quite exhausted and nearly in hysterics, was supported through the crowd to a place beside us, in front of the grating. The music struck up; the curtain was again drawn aside. The scene was as striking here as in the convent of the Santa Teresa, but not so lugu-

brious. The nuns, all ranged around, and carrying lighted tapers in their hands, were dressed in mantles of bright blue, with a gold plate on the left shoulder. Their faces, however, were covered with deep black veils. The girl, kneeling in front, and also bearing a heavy lighted taper, looked beautiful, with her dark hair and rich dress, and the long black lashes resting on her glowing face. The churchmen near the illuminated and magnificently-decked altar formed, as usual, a brilliant back-ground to the picture. The ceremony was the same as on the former occasion, but there was no sermon.

'The most terrible thing to witness was the last, straining, anxious look which the mother gave her daughter through the grating. She had seen her child pressed to the arms of strangers, and welcomed to her new home. She was no longer hers. All the sweet ties of nature had been rudely severed, and she had been forced to consign her, in the very bloom of youth and beauty, at the very age in which she most required a mother's care, and when she had but just fulfilled the promise of her childhood, to a living tomb. Still, as long as the curtain had not fallen, she could gaze upon her, as upon one on whom, though dead, the coffin-lid is not yet closed.

'But while the new-made nun was in a blaze of light, and distinct on the foreground, so that we could mark each varying expression of her face, the crowd in the church, and the comparative faintness of the light, probably made it difficult for her to distinguish her mother; for knowing that the end was at hand, she looked anxiously and hurriedly into the church, without seeming able to fix her eyes on any particular object; while her mother seemed as if her eyes were glazed, so intently were they fixed upon her daughter.

'Suddenly, and without any preparation, down fell the black curtain like a pall, and the sobs and tears of the family broke forth. One beautiful little child was carried out almost in fits. Water was brought to the poor mother; and at last, making our way with difficulty through the dense crowd, we got into the sacristy. 'I declare,' said the Countess —— to me, wiping her eyes, 'it is worse than a marriage!' I expressed my horror at the sacrifice of a girl so young, that she could not possibly have known her own mind. Almost all the ladies agreed with me, especially all who had daughters, but many of the old gentlemen were of a different opinion. The young men were decidedly of my way of thinking, but many young girls, who were conversing together, seemed rather to envy their friend, who had looked so pretty and graceful, and 'so happy,' and whose dress 'suited her so well,' and to have no objection to 'go, and do likewise.'—pp. 158—161.

The civil wars which have raged so fearfully in Mexico have given rise to innumerable bands of robbers, who infest the most public roads and render travelling extremely dangerous. Various efforts have been made to suppress this evil, but without effect, as persons of considerable influence are apparently interested in its continuance. Madame Calderon always travelled with a

military escort which insured her safety, but was frequently in the neighbourhood of marauding banditti. On one occasion, journeying from Mexico to Santa Clara, the wheels of the carriage took fire, when the following incident occurred.

'No house was in sight—no water within ken. It was a case of difficulty; when suddenly —— recollected that not far from them was on old rancho, a deserted farmhouse, at present occupied by robbers; and having ordered the coachman to drive to within a few hundred yards of this house, he sent a servant on horseback with a *medio* (fourpence) to bring some water, which was treating the robbers like honourable men. The man galloped off, and shortly returned with a can full of water, which he carried back when the fire was extinguished.

'Meanwhile we examined, as well as we could, the external appearance of the robbers' domicile, which was an old half-ruined house, standing alone on the plain, with no tree near it. Several men, with guns, were walking up and down before the house—sporting-looking characters, but rather dirty—apparently either waiting for some expected *game*, or going in search of it. Women, with rebosos, were carrying water, and walking amongst them. There were also a number of dogs. The well-armed men who accompanied us, and the name of ——, so well known in these parts, that once when his carriage was surrounded by robbers, he merely mentioned who he was, and they retreated with many apologies for their mistake, precluded all danger of an attack; but woe to the solitary horseman or unescorted carriage that may pass thereby! Nor, indeed, are they always in the same mood; for Senor ——'s houses have been frequently attacked in his absence, and his hacienda at Santiago once stood a regular siege, the robbers being at length repulsed by the bravery of his servants. p. 123.

A brief anecdote is told respecting a judicial functionary, which is not adapted to induce any very exalted notion of Mexican judges. It is as follows.

'*Apropos* to which, the —— consul told us the other day, that some time ago, having occasion to consult Judge —— upon an affair of importance, he was shown into an apartment where that functionary was engaged with some suspicious-looking individuals, or rather who were above suspicion, their appearance plainly indicating their calling. On the table before him lay a number of guns, swords, pistols, and all sorts of arms. The judge requested Monsieur de —— to be seated, observing that he was investigating a case of robbery committed by these persons. The robbers were seated, smoking very much at their ease, and the judge was enjoying the same innocent recreation; when his cigar becoming extinguished, one of these gentlemen taking his from his mouth, handed it to the magistrate, who relighted his *puro* (cigar) at it, and returned it with a polite bow. In short, they were completely *hand in glove*.'—pp. 125, 126.

We could readily extend these extracts, but have already adduced enough to acquaint our readers with the character of the work before us. It is full of amusing and not uninstructive information, abounds in anecdote and sprightly observation, and is altogether one of the most readable books which has fallen in our way for some time past.

Art. IV. *The Exclusive Claims of Puseyite Episcopalians to the Christian Ministry indefensible; with an Inquiry into the Divine Right of Episcopacy and the Apostolical Succession; in a Series of Letters to the Rev. Dr. Pusey.* By John Brown, D.D., Minister of Langton, Berwickshire. 1 Vol. 12mo. pp. 560. Edinburgh: Bell and Bradfute. London: Nisbet and Co.

'A ROSE will smell as sweet call it by what name you may.' So all men have thought; and so we had been accustomed to think, by analogy, of the Bible, and the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ—that they were just as certainly divine, just as efficient for the salvation of souls, by whomsoever their grand truths were taught, and brought to bear upon human hearts. But it seems it is not so. The theosophists of the new school authoritatively decide that the *name* imparts to the rose all its sweetness. Truly then there is 'magic in a name!' It must no more be defined the arbitrary or conventional representative of that which hitherto has been supposed to exist before it could possibly have a name; but the name now, it appears, calls that into existence which was not before, or was wholly inefficient till its name imparted to it all the virtue which it possesses. Thus a bishop would not be a bishop, whatever the qualifications he possessed, whatever the office he held, whatever the functions he performed, if he were not called a *bishop*. Suppose a minister of the gospel, possessing all the qualifications of piety, knowledge, zeal, and love; let him be chosen by an assembly of believing men to take the oversight of them in the Lord, and let him fulfil all the duties of the pastorate with the most exemplary ability and diligence, yet, if he is not either called a bishop, or if he has not had hands laid upon his head by one who claims to be an official descendant of the apostles, he neither is a true minister of Jesus Christ, nor can he effectually minister grace unto his hearers. Such is one item of the new theory of the Christian ministry.

But the dogmatic theology of these modern sages takes a still wider range, and propounds still higher discoveries. It is not merely insinuated, or left to suggested inference, it is boldly asserted, that the gospel of Christ itself is no further his gospel,

and can no longer accomplish the saving effects proposed by its divine Founder, than while it is taught by the lips of a human being called a bishop, or of some one to whom his grace-inspiring hands have communicated the authority essential to success. This is no carricature, no exaggeration. It is the identical proposition, the literal assertion made by the entire school of Puseyite doctors. It is the self-glorifying dogma which runs through their whole scheme—the *golden* thread, in more senses than one, which strengthens and renders precious the entire web of their errors, wherewith they are striving to catch the whole protestant church. The artifice with which it is interwoven into every treatise and every discussion, emanating from the party; the calm and matchless confidence with which it is asserted; the daring effrontery with which it is not merely assumed as true and irrefragable, but applied in practice, have seduced many well-meaning, but ignorant, persons into the supposition, that it must be conceded, and that there really is something in it.

Doubtless there are many individuals not yet aware of the extent to which these notions have corrupted both clergy and laity, and they may almost suspect us of misrepresentation, and of exciting needless alarm. We hope, however, such will permit us to say, that strange as these things may seem to English ears, and startling as may be the alarm we have more than once sounded, the dogmas we have named are now proclaimed from so many pulpits of the establishment, circulated so assiduously by myriads of tracts in private, and backed in so many places by high ecclesiastical authority, that it is high time every Christian should look well to the gospel which he professes to value as the foundation of his hopes, and every Englishman to the liberties, civil and religious, which his forefathers achieved for him at such a cost. The men who have revived these worn out and execrable dogmas, are fully prepared to coerce recusants, to suppress private judgment, and re-enact the inhuman butcheries of the sixteenth century, and all for the good of our souls, and love of mother church! Principles of intolerance follow as matters of course, upon the assumption of exclusive ecclesiastical rights. Uniformity has always been the idol of spiritual tyrants. More than one indication of such principles, explicit enough as to the sentiments and intentions of the party, has already appeared in print. But this is strong meat, not yet administered to the sucklings of Puseyism. *Caution* and *reserve* still limit the full disclosure of their entire theory to the holy conclave at Oxford, with their confidential agents in a few other places. The plans hitherto adopted have succeeded beyond expectation, and the progress made in the avowed design to unprotestantize England, has taken by surprise even the projectors and undertakers

of the work. The younger clergy are trotting after their teachers with the docility of lambs; and the elder ones, with a few exceptions, are going the same way, while scarce a voice is heard reclaiming against the general apostasy of the priests.

The people, however, are not yet committed to the heresy of the church, and to them the appeal of argument, of reason, and of scripture, is still open. With a free press and a Bible generally circulated in the vernacular language, the cause of truth has little to fear, even from the extensive corruption and defection of the established church. The dissenting sects are the bulwarks of the Reformation, and they will unitedly rally around its standard. The reformers may be forsaken and renounced by the degenerate sons of their own church, but in as far as they advocated the cause of God's truth and the liberty of his people, in defiance of Rome, its traditions and superstitions, they will find successors both prompt to take up, and skilful to wield, the weapons which they proved to be 'mighty through God to pull down the strong holds of sin and Satan.'

We shall claim the liberty, as professed conservators of the intellectual and spiritual health of a portion of our fellow countrymen, to repeat our warning on every suitable occasion, and to call attention both to the movements of the party, and to every well-directed measure of attack and defence. We have, therefore, brought before the notice of our readers this elaborate treatise upon the historical part of the controversy relating to apostolical succession. Before entering, however, into the merits of Dr. Brown's performance, we shall take the opportunity of offering a few observations upon the question which appears to us to be the very core of the whole controversy, and the first principle out of which all the errors and heresies of the new theory have sprung. If the momentous consequences represented by all the Puseyite clergy to attach to their doctrine of apostolical succession be really so, then both they and the doctrine itself can be sustained by divine authority; but if that doctrine be found utterly destitute of inspired sanction, then, whatever tradition or human opinion may advance in its defence, it ought to be scouted out of the church by every veritable friend of the gospel and of human nature, as a despicable piece of priestcraft It, therefore, behoves every man speedily to satisfy himself upon the question, and heroically to take his stand in defence of that party which adheres to the truth of God. Only let Scripture and reason, experience and history, be first carefully consulted, and then let the conclusion be firmly adopted and manfully sup ported, though it should be against all the bishops and clergy, both of Rome and England.

It appears to us, that the truth upon this important matter does not lie hid in a well; but is much nearer the surface than

many interested advocates would represent. The safe determination of the point at issue will not require from any person a long and laborious scrutiny.

Let those who assert the necessity and reality of an apostolical succession only be required to define their meaning, and state clearly their principles, and they may soon and readily be placed between the horns of a fatal delemma. They have hitherto dealt exclusively in generalities, and defined nothing. Let them attempt to fix ideas to their empty words, and their embarrassment will soon be made apparent. Succession to apostolic office ought to mean, according to the terms, nothing but succeeding to the apostleship. Will they pretend this? Succession to apostolic doctrine is the profession of every true Christian, and implies nothing exclusive. Will they be satisfied with this? Or, succession to apostles might signify succession to their extraordinary gifts; but they dare not profess this. If then they assert that they succeed to apostolic authority, will they be satisfied to appeal to the same vouchers, and submit it to the same tests? By any or all of these they will be equally confounded. By some of these tests let us try their exclusive claim. If it be valid, it ought to bear every scriptural rule that can be fairly applied to it.

The entire strength of their doctrine must depend upon the truth of the three following propositions, any one of which, proving either weak or absolutely false, will be fatal to the whole theory.

1. That the holy Scriptures plainly teach that the virtue of the gospel, as the sole means of human salvation, depends upon the administrator or teacher. If this proposition can be maintained, then it might follow,

2. That an order of official persons, commencing with the inspired apostles, and successively ordaining others to the same office, had been continued in an unbroken line of bishops, branching into priests and deacons, down to our own time, to whom exclusively pertained the grace of rendering the gospel efficient for the salvation of mankind.

3. That this ordination, given by bishops and received by the clergy generally, through which this mysterious authority is communicated, is a rite or ceremony clearly defined and prescribed by the same authority which establishes the gospel, which none can perform unless he bears the name and fills the office of a bishop, and which the least departure from the prescribed form would vitiate and render void.

We are well aware that the assumptions of the Puseyite clergy have not been placed upon these grounds. Far otherwise. They could not be. But we intend to affirm that no ground short of

this can support them. The pretension to exclusive efficiency, in the administration of divine grace by the gospel, can never be made to rest upon any authority, but that which at first sent the gospel; and every attempt to place it upon other and lower ground, must not only prove abortive, but expose the attempt to the charge of blasphemy, in daring to limit the prerogatives of the Deity, and its abettors to the scorn and execration of mankind. If these propositions cannot be avouched from Holy Scripture, they cannot be adequately avouched. If they are to stand by the side of the glorious gospel of the blessed God, they must stand upon his foundation, and be radiant with his light. To tell us that they may be proved by tradition and Christian antiquity, is to tell us nothing to the point. We ought to receive no tradition and venerate no antiquity that so directly contravenes and annuls the sovereign and unrestricted offer of salvation. We say, therefore, from all we have read, both in the series of Oxford Tracts, and in all the publications of the party, these are the propositions which must be maintained in order to make good the theory; and till this is done, not one step is effectually taken towards establishing the exclusive claims of the apostolic successions.

The propositions above stated would hang together securely enough for the desired purpose, provided they did but all hang together upon the desiderated divine authority, which is absolutely requisite to their support, and without which, if they boasted the universal assent of Christendom, they would be links of sand. But the *που στω* is entirely deficient. The first of these links hangs upon nothing in the sacred record. The very reverse of it may be established by the direct testimony of inspiration, which the Puseyite may be challenged to deny. Indeed, he will be a daring disciple of the school who shall adopt that first proposition. And yet, till it is adopted and defended, all the rakings and siftings of the rubbish of antiquity will never yield a solid foundation for the doctrine in question.

So momentous a matter, involving the efficiency of the gospel, must be made as clear, intelligible, and commanding as the gospel itself. From its very nature, it obviously involves the entire design of sovereign mercy, the honour and the reward of the Redeemer. Any restriction in the publication of his grace, any limit to the efficacy of his doctrine, ought to be watched with the utmost jealousy, and admitted only in obedience to the revealed will of God. It cannot rest, it ought not to rest, even upon the aggregate authority of the whole church; it must come from himself, by a clear and unequivocal oracle. Let us then, on this question, hear the word, hear the Lord, before we 'hear the church.'

It is nowhere asserted in Scripture, nor so much as hinted, that the channel by which the water of life is conveyed to a famishing world, is of any, even the slightest, importance, provided it be the pure river of the water of life that flows—*that* is represented as important, all important, and all that is important. Some channels may be prepared for the purpose, and be made more fit to convey it than others; but it does not thence follow that none other can convey it, or that any class of channels shall monopolize its flow. There is not a shadow of a pretence for any such assumption. The promise of salvation in the Scriptures is made directly to him that *believeth*, and not to any intervening human priest officiating on behalf of the believer. There is one Mediator, and but one. The priest or bishop who attempts to make his intervention necessary, is an arrogant intruder. God treats with the sinner only through Christ; but in Christ he treats with him directly, and to the exclusion of all human officials. His grace passes through no such hands. Every line of the gospel proves it. The promise of forgiveness, justification, salvation, life eternal, though preached by apostles, depended not upon their ministry for success. They themselves admit and state its independence of all human instrumentality for its ultimate success. The promises of salvation are never clogged by any such condition as Puseyites would foist upon them. Should we not be startled, confounded, by reading, 'He that believes by the ministry of Paul—he that is baptized by Peter—he that receives the consecrated elements of the supper from the beloved apostle John, or some one of his successors, shall be saved—but none of those that believe the same gospel, receive the same baptism, and supper, from any one who cannot trace his official pedigree to the apostles, or whose ordination was not performed by episcopal hands, or who underwent no ceremony of ordination at all.' If any text bearing such a meaning could be found, Puseyism might stand; certainly not without it. But, thank God, no such sentiment can be extracted from the Bible. To tradition and antiquity alone belongs the honour or the guilt of thus confining the grace of God to human channels. In the Scripture we read, 'he that believeth shall be saved'—'whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.' 'The Scripture saith, whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed.' Now, Dr. Pusey, will you have the effrontery to say—NO; the promise needs qualification? Will you have the daring impiety, the monstrous presumption, to add your codicil to this testimony, this gracious will, which the dying Saviour has ratified with his own most precious blood, and left as his last legacy to a sin-smitten world? He must, indeed, be a bold and reckless innovator upon the divine terms of salvation, who would

attempt to add so obvious, so tremendous, a restriction to the covenant of grace, as that which these presumptuous ecclesiastics have forged by the aid of antiquity, and have now announced in the name of the church. Let every Christian man unite in denouncing the perpetrators of such an outrage upon the divine charter of salvation.

We take upon us to assert, without fear of contradiction or refutation, that the promises we have quoted above, and all similar promises, of which there is a profusion equally explicit and unrestricted, secure salvation in its utmost fulness, and with all the accompanying privileges of a church-state, to every man and woman brought to believe in Jesus Christ, under any circumstances of outward administration, without regard to form, order, succession, ordination, apostleship, or episcopacy. It is absurd to maintain the reverse. It is an impious mockery both of God and man: for it is the gospel that saves the soul, and not he that ministers it. That gospel is no man's creature, subject to no man's will, dependent upon no man's agency. Even if the base and traitorous apostle Judas may be supposed ever to have preached Christ as the true Messiah, and his preaching convinced Jew or Greek, and brought him to exercise an unfeigned faith in Jesus, that individual is undoubtedly saved, though the apostolic preacher himself was found a castaway.

Agreeably with these views, the apostle Paul directs the Galatians to regard exclusively the doctrine brought to them, and not the order, succession, or ordination of those who brought it. He even supposes the case of one of the acknowledged apostles, himself it might be, or an angel from heaven, preaching *another* gospel, than that which they had already received, and he pronounces such a preacher, though apostolically sent in the first instance, and avouched by the forms of a true succession—'*accursed*'—to be held accursed by them.—Gal. i., 8, 9. This is making the doctrine the test of the true apostle, and not the name of apostle a guarantee for the doctrine. The Puseyite theory completely and utterly explodes and reverses this rule. It makes the succession, or office, a voucher for the doctrine. But the apostle John is equally explicit in stating what the people should make the rule of their acceptance of any minister or teacher. He points the individual, the private judgment even of a *woman*, to the doctrine announced, not to the official rank, title, or descent of the teacher. He says, Epistle ii., v. 10, 'If there come *any* unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed.' This would be now esteemed very harsh and uncivil treatment of a lineal descendant of the apostles. The very idea of making a clergyman first explain his doctrine, rather than show his certificate of ordi-

nation, before we acknowledge his right to teach us, and for any lady-householder to do this, is enough to make the hair of a Puseyite stand on end; and might provoke Palmer to leave such a house with cursing instead of blessing. The new school say, 'receive us, we command you in the name of Jesus Christ to receive us, simply upon the ground that we have received episcopal ordination.' How far this rule of the apostolical-succession men comports with the rule of the true apostles, given for the guidance of the whole church, the humblest Christian can discern. Both the places of inspired Scripture we have named, most fully and unequivocally concede to private Christians, and to distinct churches, the right of judging the pretensions of men, ministers, teachers, apostles, ordained evangelists, or even angels, by the agreement of their doctrine with the gospel already avouched as the testimony of Jesus; neither do these passages, nor any others, qualify or abridge that right of private judgment, or enforce the duty of acquiescing in the authority of the teacher, on any ground of office, succession or ordination—*as do all the Puseyite clergy.* The Scriptures could not lay down the Puseyite rule. It would have annulled its first rule. The two could not be reconciled. The Puseyites feel this. The apostolic rule is the nerve of protestantism. But the Puseyites hate protestantism, and are labouring to unprotestantize the nation. In so doing, they are demonstrably fighting against Paul and John. But confusion shall yet cover them and their doings.

They have asserted a pre-eminence, an exclusive right, to administer the gospel of Jesus Christ, which they cannot establish, for this satisfactory reason, that no text of Scripture can be found to limit the right of preaching the gospel to any class of men, or order of ecclesiastics. No divine authority can be produced for taking away that right of private judgment which many Scriptures have established. No text of the written word of God can be adduced in which the office of any man in the church, his personal connexion with apostles, or his ordination ceremony, is made the guarantee, and much less the sole guarantee, to individuals or communities, for the orthodoxy of the doctrine he may teach; but all are solemnly enjoined to 'try the spirits, whether they be of God;' and every teacher, whether he came from Jerusalem or Antioch, Paul, Peter, or John, was to be tested by his doctrine, and not by his name, his office, or his ordination. There were then false apostles, false prophets and teachers; and the uniform maxim of the inspired and true ministers was, try all, try even ourselves, by that word of truth and grace which had already been preached, and accompanied with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven. So much for the foundation of the heretical nostrums. In Scripture they find

none. But we pass on to the next of the three essential propositions—a real lineal descent from the apostles.

2. We may more briefly dispose of the doctrine of succession to the apostles, by plainly denying the assumed fact. No bishop of the present age can prove the connexion. If it were essential to the efficacy of the gospel, then the gospel must remain without efficacy; for no documentary evidence is in existence to sustain the claim; but there is ample evidence of the chain being broken and imperfect. Mr. Palmer has given a list, but it shows chasms, and besides, he assumes what he has not proved, and what is disputed. It is, therefore, a thing altogether unproved, and taken for granted by the new school, that such a succession, if required by Scripture, is susceptible of proof. We pronounce it as gross a piece of imposture as ever was practised by the mother of harlots. It is an ecclesiastical hoax, passed off for selfish and party purposes. Of what value is a claim founded on lineal descent of any kind, when all the links cannot be shown. Suppose a claim to an estate, or a title founded on a presumed genealogy, or a genealogy wanting only a single link; no court of justice or equity could entertain it for a moment. The challenge to produce a list of the apostolical succession, little as it would avail in the argument, supposing it furnished, has never been fairly and fully met, and never can be. The patrons of this rotten argument, of this iron and clay chain, all in fragments, filth, and confusion, that never can be tinkered or soldered together, know perfectly well that they cannot make it good. No adequate authority can be shown for the dependency or succession of three or four of the first links. Eusebius will not vouch for it. But when we come to the link at which the church of England tears itself away from the supposed apostolic succession, and refuses to submit to it any longer, but sets up for itself a distinct and independent episcopacy, disconnected wholly from the original one, that original being still continued, does not this dissolve the mystic circle, and cut off all the followers of Cranmer, in the protestant succession? The pretenders to succession may take either of these alternatives: if it did dissolve the connexion with the true succession, then what becomes of the entire church of England? If it did not, then the protesting church of England asserts a right to dissent from the judgment of the universal church; and this claim and right of private judgment, is exactly what dissenters claim in relation to herself. It cannot be wrong to imitate her example. But if she has brought with her any special virtue of ordination, and retain it, then those ejected ministers who were the founders of the dissenting ministry, equally carried with them *the virtue of their ordination*, and could equally well convey it. For they became true Scriptural bishops,

and could ordain others. Thus upon the apostolical succession scheme, either it must remain in the one exclusive line, and admit of no divergence, as in the case of the reformers, or if, as these divines of the church of England insist, it belongs to the offset as much as to the parent stock, then, by a parity of reason, it must belong to the offsets from that first offset; for if there was life in their stock after its severance, so there must be life in another stock which has taken root since its severance from themselves; and therefore the dissenting bishops of this day are just as really in the line of succession, and may just as validly call themselves *bishops* in the line of succession from the apostles, as may those who have succeeded to the episcopal dissenters of Henry VIII., Edward IV., and Elizabeth's days. The only thing the dissenting ministers lack is the title of *bishop*, which, if they think it of any importance, they may Scripturally assert to themselves, with quite as valid a claim as William of Canterbury, or Charles James of London. But Mr. Palmer, in his list, wisely passes over all the disputed names, all the gaps, all the mock-ordinations, and the fatal fracture of the reformation. If there is any truth in apostolical succession, then there cannot be one succession in opposition to the other. If the church of England claims it, it is not in Rome, if it is not in Rome, it cannot be in England, for England depends on Rome. Query—whether it is in either? But we advance to the next of the three essential propositions.

3. That the ordination given by bishops is a rite or ceremony, clearly defined and prescribed by the same authority which establishes the gospel, depending for its virtue in the ordained, upon the episcopacy of the ordainer, and the exact observance of the form.

Now whether the virtue of ordination depends upon its being performed after scriptural example, or upon the real and valid episcopacy of the ordainer, or upon the exact observance of the precise form, assumed to be appointed for the purpose, is nowhere defined. Yet the claim of the ordained clergyman to that exclusive authority which he is supposed to exercise, must depend on one, or on all of these points. Whether the virtue is in the lineal descent of the bishop who ordains, or in the mere act of laying on his hands, or in the words and actions of the rite, is never explained. It is, as yet, an obscure question, involving no little mystery. We put it, therefore, to every Puseyite to determine, for the satisfaction of the ordained, on which of these points, or whether on the conjunction of them all, his authority depends. The whole theory of ordination, as a pretence for exclusive authority, is a mere farce. Its advocates may be driven from this position by simply proving that not one of the items of their

argument can be Scripturally sustained. There is no such thing as an apostolical succession; there is no more virtue attributed in Scripture to the hands of a bishop than to the hands of any other Christian man or minister; there is no authority for any form beyond prayer; and there is no prescribed form of prayer; so that one form of ordination may be just as good as another. But the entire party decry the demand for precise definition, and endeavour to screen themselves behind an assumption of mystery, too sacred for reason. They attempt to place ordination within the sacred enclosure of sacraments, the devout observance of which is a test of submission to divine authority, the form and the reasons of which are not to be questioned. But this is mere priestcraft. We protest against the human manufacture of sacraments. Let none dare to represent that as a mystery which holy Scripture has left plain and intelligible to reason and faith. Neither Christ nor his apostles sanction any idea of mystery, or mystic virtue in the affair of ordination. It is in Scripture a mere solemn setting apart to an office, by acts of devotion appropriate to the recognition of a Christian pastor, or other divinely instituted church officer. Some religious service is sanctioned, but no form of words or acts is prescribed. The notion that none but the ordained official can administer the Christian sacraments is of ecclesiastical, not scriptural, authority. There can be no doubt that private Christians in the apostolic era, and long after, occasionally administered the sacraments. And the Puseyites know this. Yet they are labouring not only to restrict the performance of the scriptural rites to ordained ministers, but to those exclusively who have submitted to episcopal ordination.

The sum, therefore, of all that can be said and proved upon this branch of the argument is,—first, that no form of ordination was ever divinely prescribed; there is, consequently, no more authority for the precise form used in the episcopal church, than for that used by any other. But, secondly, if some specific form of ordaining were essential to pastoral authority and efficiency, and if such a form could be derived from the sacred books, still there does not exist in Scripture, there cannot be found in the earliest ecclesiastical writers, any ground whatever for the exclusive authority of bishops in this matter; none whatever for their assumed superiority over presbyters, and just as little for the human invention of diocesan bishops. Timothy was ordained by the presbytery, and is commissioned by the apostle Paul to ordain bishops and deacons as elders (presbyters) in many cities, but is never himself denominated a bishop, but is charged to do the work of an Evangelist; 2 Tim. iv. 5. So that all that is said concerning the exclusive efficiency of episcopal ordination, and its

indispensable necessity to authenticate the ministry of the gospel, has no foundation whatever in the inspired word, is mere professional trickery—the more base and despicable, as the case in which it is practised is the more solemn and sacred. It is an attempt to add human inventions to divine commands and regulations, to give them the same paramount authority, and to make them essential to the saving efficacy of the gospel itself. If this is not adding to the word of God, we should be perplexed to discover what is. Yet divine authority has, in the most solemn manner, fenced round and protected the sacred word from any such supplements. 'Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar.' (Prov. xxx. 6.) 'What thing soever I command you, observe to do it: thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it.' Deut. xii. 32; iv. 2.

Surely it becomes the men who advance these high and exclusive pretensions on behalf of themselves and their system, as they profess to fear God and venerate his revelation, to consider this fact, that in asserting the divine authority of *diocesan* episcopacy, and in denouncing the right of all ministers otherwise ordained, they are clearly guilty of adding to the words of eternal life matters that are purely of human arrangement, and which trace their origin, not to the apostles or Jesus Christ, but to the decisions of ecclesiastics and churches, which had obviously and glaringly departed from the prescriptions and examples of inspired men. They may take up what position they please in tradition or antiquity, but it is an assertion they cannot refute, that *these things are not after Christ nor his apostles.* Every man who knows what is due to the high authority of inspiration, must show his fidelity by assenting to the proposition, that no antiquity, no tradition, no church that now exists, or ever did exist, since the days of the apostles, nor all the churches in the world, had they even arrived at the most perfect unanimity, possesses any right to add to the words of revelation, to alter the charter of our salvation, restrict the liberty of preaching, or re-arrange the constitution of the church of Christ. Those who do so are guilty of the most glaring presumption, the most intolerable imposition, the most impious arrogance, which cannot fail of being visited with the threatened indignation of the Lord.

The work which we have now to introduce to the notice of our readers contains an elaborate examination of the extravagant claims and pretensions of episcopacy. The learned author first examines the testimony of the founders of the English church, its most eminent reformers, martyrs and divines, and incontestably shows that they had widely different views of the origin and nature of episcopal authority.

In justice to the author, it should be observed that we find it

necessary to pass over several letters, in which he brings forward an array of authorities from the English church against the exclusive claims of episcopacy, which it will not be easy for the new sect to set aside, and from which it would appear that there has been much garbling and mis-statement in the citations brought forward in the Oxford Tracts. We refer particularly to the attempts which are made to show those as authorities for the exclusiveness of diocesan episcopacy, who merely preferred it as an expedient useful for preserving the harmony of the church, but who have, nevertheless, in other passages of their writings, fully admitted the validity of ordination by presbyters.

Upon the question of an apostolical succession being susceptible of proof, Dr. Brown has gathered authorities which are not to be gainsayed. Let our readers take a specimen, and they will see that he has prepared some work for the fabricators of the apostolical succession scheme of the present day.

'It is impossible for you, or any of your followers, to prove that such an uninterrupted apostolical succession as that in which you glory, has been preserved in your church, or in any other episcopalian church which exists upon earth.

'Before you can either satisfy your own minds, or demonstrate to others that you have such a succession, you must be able to show *who were the bishops* from the apostolic age from whom your present clergy have derived their orders, and that there was *not so much as one of them for the last eighteen hundred years* whose baptism and ordination was irregular. If, as has already been remarked, the chain which you imagine binds you to the apostles has happened to be broken by an essential defect in the baptism or orders of any of your bishops, or of those who preceded them, whether they were the fiftieth or the hundredth, or the two hundredth in the series, it is fatal upon your principles, for it cannot be mended, and we must wait till some apostle rise from the dead, and begin a new succession, before there can be a church or a minister whose labours can be attended with the smallest benefit to the souls of men on the face of the earth. The first of these qualifications is indispensable; for, as Dr. Hickes observes, 'baptism is a fundamental qualification for the priesthood, and the want thereof *must utterly render a man incapable of being a Christian priest, because it makes him utterly incapable of being a Christian.*' And you are sensible, that by the canons of the first four general councils, which are recognised both by your church and by the Scottish episcopalian, all baptisms performed by schismatics are considered as invalid, and since the conference at Hampton Court, none but ministers who have been ordained by bishops can legally administer that ordinance. And the second qualification is no less necessary. No; I apprehend that you cannot tell who were the persons who baptized those individuals from the days of the apostles, who were afterwards bishops (and in the days of Tertullian, and afterwards, *it was often done by laymen*),

and who were the bishops that ordained the latter till the time of the reformation. The Jews had a series of genealogical tables from the time of the institution of their priesthood, by turning to which they could know at once who had been high priest or priests and levites from the days of Aaron. By appealing to them, any one who was descended from a priestly family, upon attaining the age appointed in the law, could demand that he should be put into that office; and by referring to them also, the priests and the people could ascertain whether he had a right to it, and whether his ministrations would be valid. But you, I presume, have no such record of the predecessors of your bishops from the apostolic age; nor did they succeed, like the Jewish high priests, by mere lineal descent; nor can you or the prelates of the Scottish episcopalians, who are beginning to vaunt of their apostolical succession, though their forefathers, in the nineteenth article of their confession, deny '*lineal decence*' *to be* '*a mark of the true kirk*,' produce any evidence of the regularity of their baptisms, or of the validity of their orders, or tell in many instances which of them was first, and which of them was last. Eusebius, the most early of our church historians, confesses that *he* could not do it; for he says that he was 'like a man walking through a desert, with only here and there a light to direct him;' and that he had been able to collect such notices as he had procured 'of the successors, not *of all*, but only of *the more illustrious apostles*.' And if such was his want of light in the *fourth* century, will you, or Mr. Newman, or Mr. Gladstone, throw more light on these matters *in the nineteenth?* And he says, in another page, 'who they were that, imitating these apostles (Peter and Paul), were by them thought worthy to govern the churches which they planted, is no easy thing to tell, *excepting such as may be collected from Paul's own words*.' On which, Stillingfleet remarks, 'then what becomes of our unquestionable line of succession, and of the bishops of several churches, and the large diagrams made of the apostolical churches, with every one's name set down in his order, as if the writer had been clarencieux to the apostles themselves? for all the great outcries of apostolical tradition, of personal succession, of unquestionable records, resolved at last into the Scripture itself, by him from whom all these long pedigrees are fetched? Then let succession know its place, and learn to veil bonnet to the Scriptures; and with all, let men take heed of overreaching themselves, when they would bring down so large a catalogue of high bishops, from the first and purest times of the church, for it will be hard to others to believe them, when Eusebius professeth it so hard to find them.'

'Dr. Cave admits that 'there is a wonderful and almost irreconcilable discrepancy among later as well as ancient ecclesiastical writers in determining the age and succession only of the first Roman bishops.' Bishop Jewel, though he lived *nearly three hundred years before you*, acknowledges in the most explicit terms, that it cannot be determined, for he says to Harding the Jesuit, who denied that your church had the apostolical succession, 'But wherefore telleth us Mr. Harding this long tale of succession? Have these men (papists) their own suc-

cession in so safe record? Who was then the Bishop of Rome next by succession unto Peter? Who was the second? who the third? who the fourth? Irenæus reckoneth them together in this order,—Petrus, Linus, Anacletus, Clemens. Epephanius thus, — Petrus, Linus, Cletus, Clemens. Optatus thus,—Petrus, Linus, Clemens, Anacletus. Clemens saith that he himself was next unto Peter, and then must the reckoning goe thus:—Petrus, Clemens, Linus, Anacletus. *Hereby it is clear that of the four first bishops of Rome, Mr. Harding cannot certainly tell us who in order succeeded others.* And thus talking so much of succession, they are not well able to blaze their own succession.' And says Stillingfleet, who, though he published his Irenicum when he was very young, never retracted any of its leading statements, or refuted its reasoning after he was made a bishop. Come we therefore to Rome, and here the succession is ' as muddy as the Tiber itself; for here Tertullian, Rufinus, and several others, place Clement next to Peter; Irenæus and Eusebius set Anacletus before him; Epiphanius and Optatus both Anacletus and Cletus, Augustine and Damasus with others; Anacletus, Cletus, and Linus, all to precede him. What way shall we find to extricate ourselves out of this labyrinth?' ' And as to the British churches,' he says, ' that *from the loss of the records we cannot drawe down the succession of bishops from the apostles' time !*' But if these things are so, and if you cannot trace the whole of the bishops in the different churches through eighteen centuries, and attain decisive and satisfactory evidence that their baptisms and ordinations were regular, you can have no proof that your boasted apostolical succession has been preserved either in your own church, or in the church of Rome, or among the Scottish episcopalians, or that there is a single individual on the face of the earth whom you are warranted to recognise as a Christian minister, or who has reason to hope that he has a covenanted title to the blessings of salvation.'—pp. 254—259.

The favourite author of the apostolicals and episcopalians is Cyprian, whose language, from its extravagance, as well as its total variance from that of the true apostles, sufficiently indicates the departure from the simplicity of the New Testament which had taken place in his day; and that the forms of the church had nearly extinguished its spirituality. But in appealing to Cyprian rather than to Jerome, the Puseyites are guilty of the most discreditable artifice. For if any information is needed beyond that which the sacred Scriptures supply, Jerome is the author to afford it. What he states is clear and unequivocal, and such as no other Father can be allowed to invalidate. Dr. Brown has very fully examined his writings, and given the result. A part of his testimony is all that we can make room for.

' Jerome, who is acknowledged universally to have been the most learned of the Latin Fathers, and whose veracity I believe has never been questioned, makes another statement of far greater importance

respecting diocesan episcopacy—namely, that in the comparatively limited form in which it existed in his time, it was not appointed by Christ, nor sanctioned by the apostles; and while he represents it as a mere human institution, mentions the circumstances which led to its introduction. But as I write only to ascertain what is truth, and not for victory, and as I would be sorry to impute to him a single sentiment which he did not really hold, or to deduce from his words a single inference in favour of my principles which they do not fairly warrant, I take the liberty to select from his writings the following passages:—'Let us attend carefully,' says he, in his Commentary on Titus, 'to the words of the apostle (Tit. i. 5), that thou shouldest ordain presbyters in every city as I have appointed thee. Pointing out afterwards what sort of presbyters should be ordained, he says, if any be blameless, the husband of one wife, &c.; after which, he adds, for a bishop must be blameless, as the steward of God. A presbyter, therefore, *is the same as a bishop;* and before, through the instigation of the devil, there were different parties in religion, and it was said among different people (or states), I am of Paul, I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, *the churches were governed by the common council of presbyters.* But afterwards, when every one thought that those whom he had baptized belonged to himself, and not to Christ, it was determined throughout the whole world, that one chosen from the presbyters should be placed over the rest, to whom the care of the whole church should belong, and the seeds of schism should be taken away.'

''If any should think that this is merely my opinion, and not the doctrine of the Scripture, let him read again the words of the apostle to the Philippians, 'Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi; with the bishops and deacons, grace to you and peace,' &c. Philippi is a single city of Macedonia, and certainly, in one city there could not be several bishops as they are now denominated, or of the kind that now exist. But because at that time they called the same persons bishops who were presbyters, he has spoken indifferently of bishops as of presbyters.'

''If this should still appear doubtful to any one, unless it be confirmed by another testimony, it is written in the Acts of the Apostles, that when the apostle had come to Miletus, he sent to Ephesus, and called the presbyters of the same church, to whom afterwards he said, among other things, Take heed to yourselves, and to all the flock in which the Holy Spirit hath placed your bishops, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his blood. Observe carefully, that when calling the presbyters of that one city Ephesus, he afterwards denominated *the same persons bishops.* If any one is willing to receive that epistle to the Hebrews, which is ascribed to Paul, there also the care of the church is divided among a plurality of rulers; for, says he, obey them that have the rule over you, and be subject to them, for they watch for your souls as those who must give an account, &c. And the apostle Peter, who received his name from the firmness of his faith, speaks in the same way in his epistle, saying, the presby-

ters who are among you, I beseech, who are your fellow presbyters, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, &c. The object for which we state these things, is to show that among the ancients, *presbyters and bishops were the same; but that by little and little*, that the plants of dissensions might be plucked up, the whole care of the church was committed to one. As the presbyters, therefore, know that they are subject by *the custom* of the church to him who is placed over them, so let bishops know that they are greater than presbyters, more by custom than by any real appointment of the Lord; and that they ought to govern the church *along with the presbyters*, imitating Moses, who, when he alone was to preside over the people of Israel, chose seventy with whom he might judge the people.'

'Again, he says in his epistle to Evagrius, 'I hear that a certain individual has discovered such madness as to place deacons above presbyters,—*that is, bishops;* for when the apostle plainly teaches that presbyters are the same persons who are also bishops, who can endure that a minister who waits only on the tables of the poor and widows, should in his pride exalt himself above those at whose prayers the body and blood of Christ are made? Hear a testimony in proof of this.' After which, he quotes the different passages referred to in his Commentary on Titus, and then adds, 'Do these testimonies of such men appear to you of little weight? Let the evangelical trumpet sound in your ears, the son of thunder whom Jesus loved, who drank copiously the streams of doctrine from the breast of the Saviour. The presbyters to the elect lady and her children, whom I love in the truth; and in another epistle, the presbyter to the well-beloved Gaius, whom I love in the truth. And that one was *afterwards* chosen, who was placed (or presided over, preponeretur); the rest were a remedy which was adopted against schism, lest every one drawing a church to his party should break it in pieces. For also at Alexandria, from Mark, the Evangelist, to the Bishops Heraclus and Dionysius, (or, according to Blondel, till A.D. 246), the presbyters always named as bishop one chosen from among themselves, and placed him in a higher degree, in the same manner as if an army should make an emperor, or the deacons should choose from among themselves an industrious man and call him archdeacon.' After which, he remarks respecting the terms presbyters and bishops, which he had said were applied to the same persons, that the one was a name expressive of age, the other of dignity; whence, when directions are delivered to Titus and Timothy about the ordination of the bishop and the deacon, the apostle is entirely silent about presbyters, because the presbyter is comprehended in the bishop. Now upon the account which is given in these passages of the rise of episcopacy by this early Father who lived so near to the apostles, and of whom Augustine says, 'that no man knew anything that was unknown to Jerome,' and Erasmus testifies that he was 'without controversy the most learned of all Christians, and the prince of divines,' I would make the following observations.'—pp. 443—448.

Here the author proceeds to comment upon the opinion of Mr. Boyd, a headlong advocate of diocesan episcopacy, that

Jerome was induced to deliver this statement, because 'his expectations in life were disappointed, and that disappointment vented itself in the acerbities which mark his writings; or that there was that in the haughtiness or worldliness of the bishops of his time which excited his displeasure. The purpose for which this reason is invented does no credit to Mr. Boyd's candour. But it is an edifying instance of the ease with which even the Puseyite sect can impugn the authority even of the best and most learned of the Fathers, when they advance statements which are hostile to the favourite theory. Had this eminent and early Father given an opposite opinion, he would alone have been considered sufficient authority to have finally settled the controversy. But he identified presbytery with episcopacy, and even gave the former the pre-eminence in divine sanction, and that was enough to render his testimony suspicious. His sentiments must of course be accounted for by other reasons than those derived from his sincerity, candour, and learning; and the testimony of the African Father must be of course preferred, because it is more favourable in some respects for the purpose.

But we find we must forbear. The work before us is replete with learning, and may be fairly pronounced a thorough investigation of the hollow and fallacious claims of diocesan episcopacy, in so far as these are attempted to be derived from history.

One of the most interesting letters in the series is that which relates the substance of what is known of the ancient Culdees of Iona, by whom a great part of England was converted to the faith of Christ. The testimony of Archbishop Usher, as it is brief, we subjoin:

"St. Aidan and St. Finan deserve to be honoured by the English nation with as venerable a remembrance as, I do not say, Wilfrid and Cuthbert, but Austin the monk, and his followers. For by the ministry of Aidan was the kingdom of Northumberland recovered from paganism, whereunto belonged these, beside the shire of Northumberland and the land beyond it to Edinburgh Frith. Cumberland also, Westmoreland, Lancashire, Yorkshire, and the bishopric of Durham; and by the means of Finan, not only was the kingdom of the East Saxons, which contained Essex, Middlesex, and half of Hertfordshire, regained, but also the large kingdom of Mercia converted first unto Christianity, which comprehended under it Gloucestershire, Herefordshire, Worcestershire, Warwickshire, Leicestershire, Rutlandshire, Northamptonshire, Lincolnshire, Huntingdonshire, Bedfordshire, Buckinghamshire, Shropshire, Nottinghamshire, Cheshire, and the other half of Hertfordshire. *The Scottish that professed no subjection to the church of Rome, were they that sent preachers for the conversion of these countries, and ordained bishops to govern them—namely,* Aidan, Finan, and Colman, successively, for the kingdom of Northumberland; for the East Saxons, Cedd, the brother of Ceadda, the Bishop of York, before mentioned; for the Middle Angles, which

inhabited Leicestershire, and the Mercians, Diuma; for the paucity of priests, saith Beda, constrained one bishop to be appointed over two people, and after him Cellach and Trumhere. And these with their followers, notwithstanding their division from the see of Rome, were, for their extraordinary sanctity of life, and painfulness in preaching the gospel, wherein they went far beyond those of the other side, that afterwards thrust them out, and entered in upon their labours, exceedingly reverenced by all who knew them.'—pp. 313, 314.

Now these devoted missionaries had received presbyterian ordination, though they were the means, and the sole means, of bringing so large a portion of England under the power of Christianity, and of establishing Christian churches with their pastors or bishops over them. For several hundred years the only ordination known, in connexion with the Christianity of these large districts, was unquestionably presbyterian; and the same is the only link of union between the Scottish episcopalians and the apostolic age. In these cases, therefore, the vaunted doctrine of episcopal succession is subverted and lost. Episcopacy, both in the early church of England and in Scotland, takes its origin from presbyters, who belonged to a much purer branch of the Christian church than any other then existing, with the exception of the small and humble body of confessors who maintained their independence against Rome in the valleys of Piedmont.

We must, however, terminate both our observations and our extracts. The letters of Dr. Brown, although they do not go quite far enough for us, are amply sufficient to shake the whole fabric of Puseyism upon the doctrine of apostolic succession, and can hardly fail to convince every candid reader that the system finds no support either in early antiquity or in Scripture. Whether the presbyterian platform, which Dr. Brown advocates, finds any better foundation in the only authoritative record, is another question upon which we shall not enter. The presbyterian doctrine of the parity of ministers we admit to be scriptural, for the identity of bishop with presbyter is proved by unquestionable evidence; but assuredly the system of presbyterian church courts, the subjugation of churches under a central government, and the union of Christian churches to the state, which, as the church of Scotland now finds, means the sacrifice of spiritual independence for the sake of stipend, derive as little sanction from Scripture and the earliest antiquity, as even apostolical succession and diocesan episcopacy. We thank Dr. Brown, however, for his learned, acute, and most seasonable protest against the exclusive claims of Puseyism, and cordially recommend his letters to our readers. He has rendered an acceptable service to the cause of the gospel, in defending the right of all to apostolical succession who succeed to the doctrine of the apostles; other succession there can be none.

Art. V. 1. *British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Reporter.* 3 vols.

2. *First, Second, and Third Annual Reports of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society.*

3. *An Epitome of Anti-Slavery Information: or a Condensed View of Slavery and the Slave-Trade, &c. &c.*

4. *Address to the Non-Slaveholders of the South, on the Social and Political Evils of Slavery.* By the Executive Committee of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society. Reprinted. London.

Amidst the important and exciting topics of the present day, some of which deeply concern our personal happiness as well as our civil and religious freedom, there is danger that other subjects, on which we are no less bound as men and as Christians to feel strongly, and to act vigorously, may not receive that attention which they deserve. Impressed with this conviction, we are desirous of bringing under the attention of our readers the publications placed at the head of this article, and still more, of promoting a deep interest in, and zealous efforts on behalf of, the momentous objects to which they relate — the universal abolition of the slave-trade and slavery.

We are well aware that there are few persons bearing the name of Englishmen who would not deem it a reproach to be spoken of as indifferent to the existence of these great evils, but we fear that there are too many who practically manifest little interest in their removal. This circumstance, although it may be partially accounted for by the considerations to which we have alluded, is, we believe, in a still greater degree to be ascribed to the fact that the dreadful amount of suffering, of degradation, of crime, and of mortality, to which the slave-trade and slavery are every hour giving rise, are widely removed from our observation, and are not, so frequently as they should be, brought under notice by the press, by conversation, or by public addresses. Yet there is great occasion for effort at the present moment on behalf of millions who groan under an unrighteous bondage, as well as to prevent others who are yet in the land of their fathers from being torn thence by the remorseless traffickers in human flesh. In making these needful efforts, there is also much to encourage the friends of freedom in the past history of anti-slavery efforts, and especially in the nature of those results by which their labours of love have been so abundantly rewarded.

It will not, therefore, be unprofitable to devote a few pages to the recital of what has been done, particularly in Great Britain and America, and to present to our readers a sketch of the great field of labour which yet lies before us.

We premise our statement with observing that the slave-trade between Africa and the new world, and the slavery which was founded upon it, commenced at a period not long subsequent to the discovery of America, and that all the great maritime nations of Europe at that period speedily became participators in this revolting and criminal traffic. With some little exception, it appears to have encountered no opposition from governments, but was, on the other hand, encouraged by several of those whose subjects derived from it an unhallowed gain. It is, however, grateful to reflect, that amidst the general dearth of virtuous and humane sentiment at that period, there were some distinguished men who reprobated the African slave-trade and that system of cruel bondage, to maintain and extend which it was carried on.

In the early part of the last century there were indications on the part of the Society of Friends of an increasing prevalence of just views on the subject. Towards the latter end of the same century, owing principally to the faithful and zealous labours of two persons belonging to this community in the United States, John Woolman and Anthony Benezet, no acknowledged member of that body was a slave-owner, and many had become the strenuous advocates of abolition. How much encouragement do these facts afford to labours of a similar kind on the part of the pious members of other religious communities.

Whilst the events we have noticed were in progress in America, the attention of Granville Sharpe was first directed in 1765 to the case of a sick and deserted slave, who was claimed by his former master as his bondsman. The claim was resisted by Granville Sharpe, as were others of a similar kind, until, owing to his firmness, penetration, and perseverance, it was established in a British court of justice, that a slave, on touching British ground, instantly became free. This was the first great triumph in the contest for negro rights in England.

Granville Sharpe subsequently devoted his strong intellect and energies to the inculcation of just views of the atrocities and guilt inseparable from the slave-trade and slavery. His writings on these subjects were extensively circulated both in England and America, and although so much has since been admirably written on the same topics, are still worthy of an attentive perusal. In 1773, Dr. Rush of Philadelphia, at the suggestion of Anthony Benezet, wrote and published an address to the inhabitants of the British settlements on the slavery of the negroes, and soon afterwards, another, in vindication of the first. These able publications rendered an important service to the anti-slavery cause.

Some associations on a limited scale were formed in America in 1770 to discourage the introduction of slaves, and to promote the manumission of those who were already in bondage. In 1774, James Pemberton, a member of the Society of Friends, and Dr. Rush, with some others, undertook and succeeded in the organization of an anti-slavery society for the province of Pennsylvania.

In 1776, David Hartley, son of the celebrated Dr. Hartley, made a motion in the House of Commons condemnatory of the slave-trade. The motion was seconded by Mr. George Saville, but was unsuccessful.

In 1783, the first anti-slavery committee in England was formed, consisting of six persons, most of whom were young men. Its objects were thus defined at their first meeting:—'To consider what steps they should take for the relief and liberation of the negro slaves in the West Indies, and for the discouragement of the slave-trade on the coast of Africa.' This small band of abolitionists appear to have prosecuted their work with much judgment and energy until merged in a more powerful association.

The year 1783 is also distinguished as that in which the newly formed republic of the United States determined upon the abolition of the slave-trade, but at the instance of the principal slave-owning states, allowed it to be prosecuted for a further period of twenty years.

In 1787, the London Committee for the Abolition of the Slave-trade was established, embracing the individuals belonging to the Association formed three years earlier. Granville Sharpe and Thomas Clarkson were among the number of members. Thomas Clarkson was at this time a young man, and is well known to have become deeply interested in the great object to which he now devoted his time and energies, whilst engaged in the preparation of a prize essay on the subject, 'Anne liceat invitos in servitutem dare?'—Is it right to make slaves of others against their will?

At the period at which we have now arrived, slavery existed in each of the United States of America, with the exception of Massachusetts, in which it had been recently abolished. Slaves were not, however, numerous in the Northern States. The same cruel system prevailed over nearly the whole of South America, and in every island of the West Indies. The number of the slave population on the Continent and in the islands of America fifty years since is not known, but probably amounted to nearly or quite 3,000,000.

To recruit the constant waste of life among the wretched beings thus held in bondage, and to increase cultivation, every

considerable maritime power, and some not of this description which possessed colonies in the West, were engaged in slave-trading. Great Britain took the lead in the dreadful traffic. Of 74,000 slaves exported from Africa in 1788, the subjects of Great Britain transported 36,000 to colonies belonging to England, or to foreign countries. French traders in the same year took 18,000, Portuguese 12,000, Dutch 4000, and Danish and American, 2000 each.

Such were the tremendous evils against which a few benevolent individuals and societies were to wage an arduous and holy warfare, in which they could be adequately supported or become successful only through that divine blessing for which many who were thus occupied earnestly prayed.

The struggle for abolition extended. In 1789, the Maryland Abolition Society was formed; in 1790, that of Connecticut; and in 1791, that of Virginia. In France also a similar Society was established, in which some of the most eminent men of that country took part. We cannot stay to describe the measures adopted by these different organizations, but shall notice some of the most important events which resulted from their righteous labours.

In Denmark, an Act was passed for the abolition of the slave-trade in 1792, which was not, however, to come into operation for ten years, during which period the importation of Africans was encouraged by the same act of the Danish government.

The revolution in France had now communicated its spirit to the important colony of Saint Domingo. The principal occasion of the troubles in that colony at first arose from differences respecting the admission of free coloured persons to the same rights as white citizens, an act of justice which had been sought from the French convention, but on which it had pronounced an ambiguous decision. The difference at length became so serious, that camps were formed, and the slaves were invited by each party to assist in the struggle. Such a procedure was incompatible with the continuance of slavery, and the system was abolished by an Act of the French convention in 1794. By the same authority, slavery was also abolished in all the other French colonies, but was persisted in at Bourbon, in defiance of the parent state. Thus five hundred thousand slaves came at once into the possession of freedom.

It has already been stated that slavery was abolished in Massachusetts. In 1799, an act for its gradual abolition was passed by the legislature of New York, and within the space of a few years acts of a similar description received the sanction of all the remaining states then belonging to the Union, which have since received the honourable appellation of free.

It is painful to record that while the cause of mercy and justice was thus making progress in a portion of the United States, the French government, under Buonaparte, during the short interval of peace in 1801, attempted to restore the system of bondage which it had abolished in 1794. To effect this purpose, a large force was sent to the West Indies, but failed in its object in St. Domingo, after a dreadful loss of life to those who fought in defence of freedom, and to the invading army. In Cayenne and at Guadeloupe, slavery was re-established. In the latter colony, however, the object was not attained without the destruction of nearly 20,000 negroes.

The slave-trade was also again allowed, and even encouraged, by the French government, a larger premium being offered for the introduction of slaves into their colonies than had been given previously to 1794.

In England, the people continued to manifest a deep interest in the subject, and their wishes were powerfully seconded by the labours and eloquence of some of the greatest statesmen and orators that Great Britain has produced, amongst whom the late William Wilberforce was pre-eminently distinguished. Thus recommended to the attention of government, the powerful opposition of persons implicated in the enslavement of their fellowmen was at length overcome, and an Act for the abolition of the slave-trade passed the British legislature in 1807.

No sooner had this great object been accomplished, than the African Institution was formed for the purpose of promoting civilization, industry, and commerce in Africa, and of effecting the entire abolition of the African slave-trade. In the attempt to accomplish the first of these objects, many difficulties were encountered, and the success was extremely limited. In the other portion of its labours, and especially in the effort to secure the faithful execution of British law for the abolition of the slave-trade, results of far greater importance were attained, but although thus watched, the traffic lingered for years in the British colonies; and in one of them, Mauritius, was not discontinued until after a period of many years.

In America similar difficulties attended the execution of the act for the abolition of the slave-trade.

In 1811, the slave-trade and slavery were abolished by the government of Chili, and the slave-trade by that of Caraccas. In the following year the slave-trade was abolished in Buenos Ayres, and in 1813, an act was passed in that country providing for the termination of slavery.

At the urgent solicitation of England, Sweden abolished the slave-trade in 1813, and the Netherlands in 1814. In the latter year, a treaty was concluded between Great Britain and France, by which it was stipulated that the slave-trade, which had

been effectually prevented on the part of the subjects of France by the war, should be abolished in five years, thus allowing the recommencement of that traffic. This provision of the treaty, which appears to have been very reluctantly acceded to by the British representative, as it was well known that it would be extremely unpalatable at home, gave rise to great dissatisfaction on the part of the friends of the slave in this country. A large public meeting was held in London, to afford an opportunity for the expression of this sentiment, and in the space of little more than one month, petitions were forwarded to parliament, signed by nearly a million adult males, beseeching that body to exert themselves to prevent the actual occurrence of so dreadful a calamity. Notwithstanding the sympathy of the legislature in the prayer of these petitions, and the efforts of the British government, Louis XVIII., or his ministers, could not be prevailed upon to alter the criminal course on which they had resolved. The French slave-trade was, however, shortly afterwards abolished by Buonaparte, during his temporary resumption of power, and this act was confirmed by Louis XVIII. on his restoration.

In Java, a society, called the 'Java Benevolent Society,' was formed in 1816, whose objects were to secure the abolition of the slave-trade, and to promote the abolition of slavery. Measures for the gradual abolition of the latter evil were in this year adopted also in Ceylon. In 1819, the abolition of slavery was resolved upon at Malacca, in 1820 in Sumatra, and in the same year, the Spanish act for the abolition of the slave-trade came into operation. In 1821, it was determined to abolish slavery in Peru, in 1822 in Columbia, and in 1823, at Singapore.

The London Anti-Slavery Society was established in 1823; and a motion, pledging the House of Commons to the abolition of slavery, was submitted to that assembly by Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton. The motion was not carried, but the principle which it involved was adopted by the House.

In 1824, the most complete description of the character of negro bondage which had yet appeared, written by the late James Stephen, Esq., was published, entitled, 'The Slavery of the British West India Colonies delineated, as it exists, both in law and practice, and compared with the slavery of other countries, ancient and modern.' In this year the slave-trade was abolished by Mexico.

In 1825, indications were manifested of improved sentiments in France, on the subject of the slave-trade, which were probably owing to the efforts made to enlighten the public mind by the circulation of books, and some able speeches recently delivered in that country, especially one, full of information and eloquent reasoning, by the Duke de Broglie.

During the few subsequent years acts for the abolition of the slave-trade, or the gradual abolition of slavery, were passed in various American states not already noticed. There is, however, too much reason to believe that in some of these Republics, these laws were not faithfully executed. The most deplorable instance of their extensive violation has taken place in Peru; while Mexico affords, perhaps, the most satisfactory instance of their entire fulfilment, where freedom was conferred on the whole slave population in 1829. In the same year the slave-trade was legally abolished in Brazil.

We have already noticed the neglect, to no inconsiderable extent, of laws for the abolition of the slave-trade by the United States of America and Great Britain. These infractions of law by the introduction of slaves into the states of America, or into the colonies of our own country, were, however, inconsiderable in their extent, compared with those which took place in Brazil and the Spanish colonies; in which the act of abolition was a cruel mockery, procuring for the slave, during his voyage from Africa, a larger portion of misery than before, and occasioning a greater amount of mortality on the passage, as it was no longer subjected to inspection. In the slave colonies of France and Holland, during a long period, an equal disregard of law and treaties was evinced; but the governments of these countries have recently been more attentive to the engagements which they had contracted.

We shall not dwell upon the English act passed for the abolition of slavery in 1833, or the actual termination of the delusive and cruel system denominated apprenticeship, by which 800,000 of our fellow-subjects were established in their rightful freedom; the earnest, we trust, of the universal abolition of slavery. To promote this great object a society was formed, immediately after the entire liberty of our bondsmen in the British West Indies had been secured, entitled 'The British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, for the abolition of slavery and the slave-trade throughout the world.' A protection of the rights and interests of the enfranchised population in the British possessions, and of all persons captured as slaves, were also among the objects prominently contemplated by the new society. Since its establishment, visits have been paid by persons connected with it, for the purpose of advancing the anti-slavery cause, to the United States of America, Brazil, France, Spain, Holland, Portugal, Denmark, and Sweden. The publications of the society, especially *The Anti-Slavery Reporter*, published once a fortnight, in the form of a newspaper, and stamped, has been circulated in all these countries. At home, pains have been taken, not without some success, to shield the newly enfranchised popula-

tion of the British West Indies, and those other colonies in which slavery has given place to freedom from oppressive laws and conduct. Slavery, which, it was found, had still been allowed to remain in Malacca, Singapore, Penang, and Province Wellesley, is now, there is reason to believe, terminated, at the pressing instances of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society. The society has also repeatedly urged upon the government the duty of the abolition of slavery in British India; and measures for the accomplishment of this object are likely soon to be adopted, if they have not already been carried into effect.

In the United States of America, the same noble spirit which led the Society of Friends in that country early to wash their hands from the stain of oppression, has of late years awoke with more than its pristine energy. Numerous societies are urging the right of the slaves to freedom; their cause has been pleaded by the most distinguished writers which that country has recently produced, including Dr. Channing, Judge Jay, Theodore Weld, the Poet Whittier, and many others; and is besides advocated in numerous anti-slavery newspapers or periodicals.

In France, an Abolition Society has been established for ten years past, over which the Duke de Broglie presides, many of whose members are persons possessing a large amount of influence in the French chambers and in the country. A measure for the abolition of slavery in the colonies of France has been lately recommended by a commission appointed by the king, but we regret to say that it is far from satisfactory, and utterly fails to meet the obvious requirements of justice.

In Holland, Anti-slavery Societies were formed during the past year at the Hague and Rotterdam, and a deep interest in the subject has been awakened in several other principal towns in that country. We were glad to learn by a recent letter from a worthy friend of the cause in Holland, that 'a Dutch translation of J. J. Gurney's Winter in the West Indies has been published at Groningen, and is much read.'

In Spain, Portugal, Denmark, Sweden, and in the island of Malta, there are known friends of the slave; and in Portugal, a commission appointed to consider a project submitted by the Viscount Sa de Bandeira and Count Lavradia to the Chamber of Peers, for the abolition of slavery in Portuguese India, has very recently brought in a highly favourable report. The capitals of Sweden and Malta have each an Anti-slavery Society, which we cannot doubt will be productive of important benefits to those whose deliverance from bondage they are intended to promote.

We now proceed to give the general result of what has been done for the abolition of the slave-trade and slavery during the period embraced in our narration.

The African *slave-trade* has been legally abolished in all civilized countries, and exists, so far as we know, only in Brazil and the Spanish colonies. *Slavery* has been abolished in one-half of the States of the North American Union. It is no longer to be found, or only to a small extent, in a large portion of South America, formerly belonging to the crown of Spain. In the West Indies, however, the greatest triumph has been achieved. In those regions, formerly tenanted by the victims of despair, liberty is now enjoyed by nearly two millions of emancipated slaves. Immense advantages have accompanied the establishment of freedom in all these regions. In the British West India colonies, with which we are best acquainted, we are warranted in affirming, on the authority of parliamentary reports, of statements of ministers of the crown, of information furnished by intelligent travellers, and of accounts from missionaries,—that an increase of happiness, and an advance in civilization, morality, and religion, have taken place, to which no parallel can be found in any other part of the world during the same period of time.

In other regions where slavery has been allowed to remain, the evil has acquired a gigantic magnitude by the natural increase which has taken place among its wretched victims, or by constant and large supplies from the desolated continent of Africa. We shall supply information on this subject from the works before us, and on the same authority shall furnish some particulars respecting the character and consequences of the slave system.

We extract from the 'Epitome of Anti-slavery Information,' an account of the slave population under professedly Christian governments.

'Slave Population under nominally Christian Governments.

North America.—United States - - -		2,483,536
	Texas - - -	75,000
South America.—Columbia - - -		152,000
	Brazil - - - -	2,500,000
	Peru - - - -	284,773
	Surinam - - -	55,000
	Cayenne - - -	16,140
West Indies -	Spanish Colonies - -	600,000
	French do. - - -	170,603
	Danish do. - - -	38,000
	Dutch do. - - -	17,000
	Swedish do. - - -	5,248
		6,397,300'

On the subject of the slave-trade, the following statements are made:—

'THE SLAVE TRADE.

'Upon the most moderate computation, the slave-trade dooms to the horrors of slavery every year, among

Christian powers - - - - - -	120,000
Mahommedan powers - - - - -	50,000
	170,000
Destroyed annually in procuring the above -	280,000
Making a total of - -	450,000

'Of every thousand victims to the slave-trade, *one-half* perish in the seizure, march, and detention on the coast; *one-fourth* of those embarked perish during the middle passage; and *one-fifth* of those who are landed, perish in the seasoning during the first year, and the remaining three hundred, with their descendants, are doomed to hopeless bondage and a premature grave. It is computed that there are not less than 20,000 Africans shut up in the holds of slavers on the Atlantic at the present moment, suffering all the horrors of 'the middle passage.'

'AFRICAN SLAVE TRADE SINCE 1808.

Carried away from Africa for the Brazils -	2,420,000
Do. do. Cuba and Puerto Rico -	1,020,000
Do. do. French colonies, Mexico, and the United States - - - - -	300,000
Captured and liberated, and died after capture, about - - - - - -	140,000
(1808 to 1840) Total - -	3,880,000

'The numbers that die on the middle passage, the decrease by deaths over the births, and the number yearly enfranchised in the colonies, are equal to at least 25 per cent. on the number shipped from Africa.'

It is well known to all persons acquainted with the history of the slave trade and slavery, that the Spanish slave-code has long been regarded as a model of slave legislation. The opinion has also, in past time, been extensively prevalent, that the character of slavery in the Spanish colonies was mild,—the ne-plus-ultra of a merciful system of bondage. It will be seen from the following extract from an article in the 'Anti-Slavery Reporter,' founded upon the statements of foreign writers, how far removed from truth is this supposition, and how ineffectual are all laws for the protection of slaves from oppression:—

'We would now direct attention to the appalling fact of the dreadful mortality among the slave population in Cuba. This appears to be estimated by J. A. Saco at nearly 10 per cent., and by the Countess Merlin at this amount annually. (Mi primera pregunta, p. 22. Los Esclavos Espanoles, p. 63.) Baron Humboldt states the general mortality among the slaves to exceed eight per cent. yearly (Ensayo Politico sobre la Isla de Cuba, p. 33); and that which takes place among the newly imported Africans as averaging from ten to twelve per cent. (*Ib.*, p. 61.) We extract some explanatoryremarks of the Baron Humboldt, on the subject of the ravages made by death among the slave population:—

'"The mortality of the negroes differs greatly in the island of Cuba, as in all the Antilles, according to the nature of the cultivation, the humanity of the masters or administrators, and according to the number of negresses employed in the care of the sick. There are plantations on which there die annually from fifteen to twenty per cent.'—*Ensayo Politico*, pp. 149, 150.

'The occasion of the very large mortality on some plantations appears to be indicated by the startling paragraph we are about to transcribe, which immediately follows that which we have just quoted:—

'"We have heard it discussed with the greatest composure, whether it was most advantageous for the proprietor not to exhaust the slaves by excessive labour, and consequently to have less frequent occasion to replace them, or to obtain from them as much work as possible in a few years, and thereby have occasion to replace them more frequently.

'"Such,' Baron Humboldt observes, 'are the calculations of avarice when man uses his fellow-man as a beast of burden.'"—*Ensayo Politico*, p. 150.

'We find no notice of the dreadful mortality among the slaves in M. Torrentes' Memorial. It is scarcely needful to remark, that this single fact of so large a mortality at once disproves the monstrous statements which he has made relative to the happy condition of the slaves in Cuba.

'In forming a correct estimate of the character of slavery, it will be evident to a reflecting mind, that much of its severity or otherwise must depend on the character of those to whom its administration is in a large number of instances intrusted—the managers and drivers of estates. In this point of view the information incidentally given by the Countess Merlin, contained in several passages of her work, is of much value. For example, we find the overseer spoken of as being 'always harsh and inexorable in his severity, but (that) the most fearful adversary is the driver, a slave like the rest, and on this account unfeeling and cruel towards his companions, especially those who have belonged to a tribe hostile to his own. Then (it is added) he becomes ferocious and implacable by a spirit of revenge.' (*Los Esclavos Espanoles*, &c., p. 62.)

'The attention to morals in Cuba, and the value of the religious

instruction communicated, may be judged by the following statement of the same author:—

'' The habitual idleness of the negroes, the heat of the African blood, and the indolence which results from the want of responsibility concerning their own condition, makes them contract the most disorderly practices. They seldom marry,—and why? The husband and wife can at any time be sold to different masters, and their separation prove eternal. Their children do not belong to them; and deprived of domestic felicity, as well as a community of interests, the ties of nature are limited among them to the instinct of a violent and unrestrained sensuality.' (*Los Esclavos Espanoles*, p. 46.)

'It would be easy to extract other passages equally decisive in the work of the Countess, on the subject of the general demoralization of the slaves, which is, we believe, an universal consequence of slavery.

'It will be seen, in addition to this deplorable result of slavery, under any circumstances, that in Cuba there is no provision made, owing to the great inequality of the sexes in the slave population of this island, for the general formation of those ties designed by the Almighty to bind men together, and which contribute so largely to individual and social happiness, to purity of morals, and to the prosperity of countries. In the last census which we have seen, the number of slaves of each sex was respectively, as already stated, 183,290 male slaves, and 103,652 female slaves. The disproportion of males to females was probably much greater in the adult than in the younger portion of the slave population, because, as is well known, the number of male and female children born in all countries is nearly equal. We extract a passage from the work of Baron Humboldt, which has reference to the great inequality of the sexes that has prevailed in a particular district of Cuba, and particularly upon plantations:—

'' In the district of Batabano, which contained in 1818 a population of 2,078, with thirteen sugar-works and seven coffee-plantations, there were 2,226 negroes, and 257 negresses, (proportion 8 to 1.) In the jurisdiction of S. Juan de los Remedios, which, in 1817, contained a population of 13,700, with seventeen sugar-works, and seventy-three coffee-plantations, there were 1,200 negroes, and 660 negresses, (proportion 1·9 to 1.) In the jurisdiction of Filipinas, which consisted, in 1819, of a population of 13,026, there were 2,494 negroes, and only 997 negresses, (proportion 2·4 to 1;) and if in the whole of the island of Cuba the male slaves are, with respect to the females, as 1·7 to 1, they are in the sugar-works nearly 4 to 1.' (*Ensayo Politico*, p. 141.)

'We find in the work of the Countess, a passage which gives an affecting insight into the treatment of slaves who commit the heinous offence of seeking to gain that freedom, to which all of them have an indefeasible right by a higher law than that of man, and of which a large portion are, as has been seen, deprived by a flagrant violation of the laws of the colony—laws which the slave-holder is ever ready to invoke, and professes to respect, when they favour his own supposed

interest; but which he utterly disregards and treads contemptuously under foot, when they interfere with it. It is said that the runaway slave generally seeks a refuge in the high and thick grass enlaced with the gigantic *cana-brava;* or otherwise taking refuge in the mountains, he selects his habitation in the virgin forests. There, protected by the impenetrable bulwarks of trees of a great age, he defies the authority of the master, the rigour of the overseer, and the assassin tooth of the dog. Very soon hunger and despair oblige him to betake himself to the plains, preferring the life of a vagabond, with its danger, to the yoke of labour. Notwithstanding, when the hour of repentance arrives, he implores the mediation of his padrino, (godfather,) who leads him again to the pen, and obtains in this way his pardon, without any kind of punishment; but if the fugitive is forcibly apprehended, or runs away a second time, fetters are put upon him, to prevent his doing so again, and justice has no bounds.'' (*Los Esclavos Espanoles*, pp. 53, 54.)

' We only add one out of several passages in the Political Essay of Baron Humboldt, in which the impossibility of protecting slaves by law from ill-usage and abuse are judiciously, and, as we think, convincingly stated :—

'' Notwithstanding the wisdom and mildness of Spanish legislation, to what excesses does not a slave remain exposed in the solitude of a plantation or estate, where a brutal driver, armed with a cutlass and a whip, exercises with impunity an absolute authority. It is true that the law permits the slave to make complaint to the magistrate, in order that the latter may order the master to be more just; but this recourse is almost entirely illusory, because there is another law, by which any slave who is found, without having received permission, a league and a half from the plantation to which he belongs, must be taken up, and delivered to his master. How can the slave, scourged and worn by hunger and excessive labour, place himself before the judge ? And if arrived, how shall he defend himself against a powerful master, who cites for witnesses the hired accomplices of his own inhuman punishment ?'' (*Ensayo Politico*, p. 280.)

Want of space will not allow us to adduce, at length, evidence of the great extent of the slave-trade in Cuba since it has become illegal, and of the increased cruelty by which it has been accompanied. The fact of the extensive violation of the law is sufficiently proved by the recent immense increase of the slave population, notwithstanding the dreadful mortality existing amongst them. In 1817, three years before the legal abolition of the trade, the slave population amounted to 199,145, and is now nearly, or quite, 600,000.

That a very large part of the slaves now in the island of Cuba have been illicitly introduced, and are consequently held in bondage contrary to the laws of Spain, and the treaty between that country and Great Britain is thus acknowledged by two

apologists for slavery—the former a Creole, and the latter a Spaniard,—the Countess Merlin and M. de Torrentes.

'The slaves employed in field labour are all *bozals*, and can scarcely explain themselves in our language.' (*Los Esclavos Espanoles*, p. 58.)

'The government may be assured, that in the class indicated for emancipation (slaves for whom liberty is claimed by the British Government, in consequence of their introduction since 1820) is to be found the greater part of the African population.' (*Memoria sobre la Esclavitud*, p. 41.)

We copy from the 'Anti-Slavery Reporter' the following statement relative to the '*emancipados*,' borrowed from the Countess Merlin.

'The cargoes of *emancipados* (negroes brought to the island without legal authorization) were delivered to the governor, who distributed them between various individuals, receiving an ounce of gold for each yearly. At the end of the first year, these negroes were to be presented to the governor, who, after having ascertained that they had not learned a trade, (which none learned,) delivered them again to the same individuals, and always for two years, by which means their lot is precisely the same as that of the slaves, with the difference of being deprived of the care and protection of the master. Those who take charge of them having no interest in their preservation, put them to the most severe labour; and not being permitted to liberate themselves from their slavery by money, it becomes, in fact, eternal. So debased and miserable is the condition of the *emancipado*, that it is stated 'he is an object of contempt to the slave; whenever these (the slaves) wish to convey an insult to one of this class, they say to him, Thou art nothing but an emancipado.'' (*Los Esclavos Espanoles*, p. 33.)

In addition to the deplorable circumstances already stated relative to slavery in Cuba, we learn, from the publications before us, that there are large numbers of slaves in that island who were brought thither, contrary to British law, from our West India islands, during the period of slavery. These, unless slavery should be shortly abolished in Cuba, or a strenuous effort be made for their deliverance, will be compelled to wear out the remainder of their lives in miserable bondage.

We are grieved to state further, that there are slaves held by Companies in Cuba, in which persons in England are largely interested. Of these, we believe, the Cobre Copper Association is the principal, by which about four hundred human beings are held in bondage. From the last report made to the proprietors of this Company, at which Sir John Pirie, Bart., presided, it appears that the atrocious and wicked system which that association contributes to support, has not lately been productive of prosperity, in a region exceeded by none, perhaps, in mineral

riches and in the fertility of its soil. We quote the paragraph in the report of the Cobre Copper Association, which has reference to the existing distress in Cuba.

'The general depression of commerce has nowhere been more felt than in the island of Cuba, where the colonial produce in general has been selling so low, as to occasion great distress and embarrassment amongst the inhabitants, in consequence of which, the Company's agents, not having the same facility of obtaining money on the spot, for their bills on the directors, it has been found necessary to authorize them to draw in anticipation of their wants, and to obtain supplies of cash, through the banks in Jamaica and St. Thomas's; the effect of which has been to place the Company under an advance of upwards of 10,000*l.* on this account.'

We are glad to know that the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society have urgently solicited the government to use its influence for the deliverance of the hundreds of thousands of slaves in Cuba, who are held in violation of the slave-trade treaty with this country, and for the liberation of the *emancipados* and of the British slaves who are in the island.

To the two former of these requests our government appear to have paid attention, as a claim has subsequently been addressed to the government of Spain for the restoration of the victims of the illicit slave-trade, so long shamelessly carried on in Cuba, and of the no less wronged 'emancipados.'

In Brazil, we find all those dreadful evils by which slavery in Cuba is characterized, except that there are not, so far as we are aware, any British subjects submitted to its barbarous discipline. In other respects, the principal difference in the circumstances of slavery in the two countries, is, that in Brazil the evils exist upon a much larger scale than in Cuba, as they inflict misery upon more than four times the number found in that island.

We now turn to the state of slavery in the great prison-house of the Southern States of the North American Union. In doing this we shall extract some of the statements contained in the admirable 'Address to the non-slaveholders of the South, on the social and political evils of slavery,' which is understood to have proceeded from the pen of Judge Jay.

The following passage describes the influence of the opposite systems of slavery and freedom on population.

'The ratio of increase of population, especially in this country, is one of the surest tests of public prosperity. Let us then again listen to the impartial testimony of the late census. From this we learn that the increase of population in the free states from 1830 to 1840, was at the rate of thirty-eight per cent., while the increase of the *free* population in the slave states was only twenty-three per cent. Why this

difference of fifteen in the two ratios? No other cause can be assigned than slavery, which drives from your borders many of the virtuous and enterprising, and at the same time deters emigrants from other states and from foreign countries from settling among you.

'The influence of slavery on population is strikingly illustrated by a comparison between Kentucky and Ohio. These two states are of nearly equal areas. Kentucky, however, having about 3000 square miles more than the other. They are separated only by a river, and are both remarkable for the fertility of their soil, but one has, from the beginning, been cursed with slavery, and the other blessed with freedom. Now mark their respective careers. In 1792, Kentucky was erected into a state, and Ohio in 1802.

1790	Free population of Kentucky,	61,227,	Ohio a wilderness.
1800	— —	180,612,	— free population, 45,365
1810	— —	325,950,	— — 230,760
1820	— —	437,585,	— — 581,434
1830	— —	522,704,	— — 937,903
1840	— —	597,570,	— — 1,519,467

The representation of the two states in Congress has been as follows:—

1802,	Kentucky	6,	Ohio 1
1812,	—	9,	— 6
1822,	—	12,	— 14
1832,	—	13,	— 19
1842,	—	10,	— 21

The value of land, other things being equal, is in proportion to the density of population. Now the population of Ohio is 38·8 to a square mile, while the free population of Kentucky is but 14·2 to a square mile,—and probably the price of land in the two states is much in the same proportion. You are told much of the wealth invested in negroes —yet it obviously is a wealth that impoverishes, and no stronger evidence of the truth of this assertion is needed, than the comparative price of land in the free and slave states.'

The progress of the free population in the whole of the free and slave states respectively is thus stated:—

'At the first census, in 1790, the free population of the present free states and territories was - - - - - -	1,930,125
Ditto of the slave states and territories - - - -	1,394,847
Difference - - - - -	535,278
By the last census, 1840, the same population in the free states and territories - - - - - -	9,782,415
In the slave states and territories - - - -	4,793,738
Difference - - - - -	4,988,677

'Thus it appears, that in 1790, the free population of the south was 72 per cent. of that of the north, while in 1840, it was only 49

per cent.; while the difference in 1840 is more than *nine* times as great as it was in 1790.'

We extract from the same publication an account of the extent of education provided for 'scholars at public charge' according to the last census in the free and slave states.

'The census gives us a return of 'scholars at public charge.'

Of these there are in the free states	- - -	432,173
—— slave states	- - -	35,580

'Ohio alone has 51,812 such scholars, more than are to be found in the thirteen slave states! Her neighbour Kentucky has 429!'

The following description is given, on a Southern authority, of the wretched moral condition of the American slave:—

'From long continued and close observation, we believe that their (the slaves) moral and religious condition is such that they may justly be considered the HEATHEN of this Christian country, and will bear comparison with the heathen in any country in the world. The negroes are destitute of the gospel, and ever will be under the present state of things.'—*Report published by the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia, Dec. 3rd*, 1833.

The different degree of attention paid to the religious instruction of the young in the free and slave states will be seen in the following statement:—

'In the Tenth Report of the American Sunday School Union [p. 50] is a table showing the number of Sunday School scholars in each State for the year 1834. From this table we learn that

There were in the free States	- - -	504,835 scholars.
—— slave —	- - -	82,532 —
The single State of New York had	- -	161,768 —

'About twice as many as in the thirteen slave States!'

We must refer to the publications we have quoted for more full information relative to the state of slavery in those countries to which they relate. Enough has, we hope, been advanced to prove the vast importance of the work in which the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society is engaged, and the claim which it has to public sympathy and support.

We hope that the approaching Anti-Slavery convention will do much to promote the cause of freedom by affording a fresh opportunity of exposing before the world the unchristian character and the cruel and disastrous consequences of slavery in the various countries in which it prevails, and the duty, safety, and policy of emancipation.

We shall conclude with extracting from the 'Anti-Slavery

Reporter' an invitation to this convention, to which we cordially bespeak the attention of all our readers, and sincerely desire that the blessing of the Most High may rest upon its deliberations and proceedings.

'The anniversary meetings of the great, religious, and philanthropic institutions of this country have already commenced; and during the course of the next month or six weeks will be continued. Thousands of the most active and intelligent friends of education, of Bible circulation, and of missions, from various parts of the country, and from abroad, will assemble in this great metropolis, to recommend by their eloquence, to sustain by their liberality, and hallow by their prayers, these various and important objects. A fitting sequel to these meetings will be the great Anti-Slavery Convention, which the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, in accordance with the resolution of the convention held in 1840, has convened to be holden at Freemasons' Hall, on Tuesday, the 13th of June next, and for as many successive days as may be necessary to bring the business which may be brought before it to a close. The venerable Thomas Clarkson, though bowed down under the weight of nearly eighty-four years, has consented to be its President. At that Convention, the condition of millions of the human race now held in slavery will be presented to the prayerful sympathies of the Christian philanthropists who may be assembled. The friends of education will there find, who, of all the human family, are most deprived of the treasures of knowledge; the friends of the Bible will there discover, who, of all their fellow-men, are most shut out of the light of that sacred volume; and the friends of missions will there learn, who, of all the heathen, are most denied the instruction and consolations of the Gospel. Nor are they summoned merely to behold the misery, degradation, and oppression of millions of the human race; information will be laid before them of the progress and principles of the Anti-Slavery cause in this and in other countries, and their united councils and support will be requested to forward the great object it will have in view—viz., the universal extinction of slavery and the slave-trade.'

Art. VI. *The Wives of England, their Relative Duties, Domestic Influence, and Social Obligations.* By the Author of 'The Women of England.' pp. 370. 1843. Fisher, Son, and Co.

We are happy to meet Mrs. Ellis again in the high and solemn work of improving her own sex. We are of those who think that the greatest benefactors of women must be women. Not ignorant, or unmindful, of the imputed prejudice in favour of their own sex, or of the imputed jealousy with which their efforts to benefit their sex are usually received—a prejudice and a jealousy which may be fairly allowed to exist to a certain extent, our opinion is yet decidedly in favour of their agency in the

department of service to which Mrs. Ellis has devoted her valuable labours. The advantages with which it is connected more than counterbalance its disadvantages. For the objection felt by females to female correction and advice is felt in greater strength to correction and advice from the other sex, while if the female adviser and corrector be wise and honest, her views and suggestions will have a worth which nothing but her experience and position could possibly impart. True it is that as to some of the outward forms and acts of women, men may take the fullest and most accurate view, just on the principle that to look from without is necessary to the perception of that which often cannot be seen, or else seen so well, from within, but there are some things, and woman is among the number, whose hidden depths are infinitely more important than their outward show, and therefore we should require in any one contemplating her moral welfare, a woman's perception of her defects, and a woman's knowledge of the mode of their removal.

Mrs. Ellis has these qualifications in an uncommon degree, and combining them with others which are equally necessary to success, we have sincerely rejoiced in witnessing her skilful and faithful labours. Her 'Women of England,' 'Daughters of England,' and 'Wives of England,' have been precious boons to her own sex, and, through that, to the other. Without professing an unqualified approval of all their sentiments, sometimes perhaps presumptuous enough to fancy the disclosure of the philosophy of acts and habits too limited and superficial, or the censure too sweeping, or the enforcement of particular duties too abstract and comprehensive, and without saying that in some cases a more severe revision would not have imparted additional accuracy, and vigour, and purity, to the style—we yet can conscientiously aver that no works within our knowledge are equally calculated to interest by their cheerful, pleasant composition, and to instruct by their sagacious, honest counsels, those for whom they are designed. We have, on a former occasion, expressed our high admiration of the healthful moral tone of Mrs. Ellis's writings. The publication before us has excited the same admiration. To 'write no line which dying one would wish to blot' when addressing oneself to a subject so full of all that is delicate in human motives, and all that is powerful in human influence, as that last chosen by our author, and to do this when upon that subject there abound endless errors and falsities of sentimentality and of sin, is a display of honesty and courage, as well as wisdom and morality, which should be appreciated and honoured. This is what Mrs. Ellis has done. To do it might have been easy, had she contented herself with generalities; but so far from this, our wonder has

been, in reading the 'Wives of England,' how she has managed to bring in so vast a variety of illustrations and applications of her principles and suggestions, without detracting from the general interest of her work. The most thoughtless of her sex cannot be at a loss to discover wherein she fails; and so earnest and respectful is the spirit, and so just and serious the reasoning, that we would fain hope the most defective must be benefited by a perusal.

If our interest in the present volume is somewhat less than we have felt in some of Mrs. Ellis's former publications, it is not because its character is inferior, but its promise of usefulness is less bright. It is addressed to a class not less worthy of attention, or perhaps less requiring improvement, but a class that affords less encouragement to the faithful monitor than that of the 'Daughters of England.' However far the 'Wives of England' may be from what they might be, it is a melancholy fact, that they are likely to remain much like what they are, after all the influence of instruction and of argument that can be brought to bear upon them. And this is only saying of them what we would as readily say of their partners; and what a knowledge of human nature and human history would abundantly support. Wives are not, by any means, as hopeful subjects of reformation as daughters. They are less susceptible, they are more occupied and engaged; change in them would affect a wider sphere, and produce a more serious impression, and attract more painful notice. If then we would have wives to be 'thoroughly furnished' for their functions, the process of preparation must not be delayed till they are wives; if so, it will have to be conducted amid many disadvantages, and with promise of but limited results. Fitness, mental and moral fitness for marriage, with all its solemn responsibilities, must be acquired before marriage. We do not deny that a measure, sometimes a large measure, of it may be obtained afterwards, but we do assert as a fact, whose evidence is as complete as its nature is painful, that nothing can compensate for neglect during the period of girlhood and unmarried womanhood. The work before us is calculated to do as much for wives as may be done, and for that reason we warmly recommend it, but still we expect more good from the former one, or from this one as read by those who are not wives.

It is impossible to contemplate with too deep a regret for all the interests affected, the almost utter forgetfulness in the training and education of our women, of the duties and trials connected with the offices and positions they are destined to occupy. They are, for the most part, brought up with a view to anything rather than that for which they are intended. If wisdom consists in the selection of the best end, as well as the

best means, there is a deplorable lack of it in the treatment they receive. The result is, that they anticipate their future state and relations under the influence of delusive views, and without any energetic efforts to be made meet for them. As Mrs. Ellis truly observes, marriage, like death, is esteemed an end. Regarded, however, in its most solemn and spiritual aspects, it is anything but an end. Whatever it terminates, it introduces to scenes and services whose nature and issues may well occasion trembling anxieties and 'great searchings of heart' to those that enter upon it. Next to the being born, it is the most important epoch of our earthly history. It is indeed a being born itself. The soul awakens then to a new and higher life. Its own faculties and passions receive a fresh and strange development. An unknown and deeper fountain of feeling is opened. And while it lives as under an influence but just shed forth upon it, it also lives in the life of another after a manner so mysterious as to have been preceded by nothing like it in the previous history of the heart. Its sympathy becomes a different feeling from what it used to be—in tenderness, and force, and fulness. It becomes *the* feeling of the heart. Every affection has new relations and a new sphere, and its most sacred and delicate movements can scarcely so well be said to be secret as exposed. There is an inevitable participation of fearful secrets, and the action and reaction of irresistible influences. And if this, and more than this, is the necessary result of marriage, surely one of the most important aims of education should be to prepare for it. And until it become one—until our daughters are taught and disciplined with a view to fit them for the moral mysteries, the solemn sympathies, the responsible and never ceasing duties, the constant watchfulness, and patience, and activity, of married life, we shall despair of seeing any very signal change in our wives. The views entertained of marriage must give place to views more just and serious. It must be considered as a state not of ease, but healthful and onerous duty; as one not of selfish repose and pleasure, but of self-denial and circumspection; as one of service, not reward. It is, in a most important sense, the beginning rather than the end of the race. And when it shall be generally regarded in that light, and anticipated with that view, British maidens will bring to it hearts full of solemn purposes and well-nourished principles, wise and strong to cultivate the real world before them, instead of languishing to inhabit and enjoy the 'new earth' which but too often fills their imaginations only to disappoint their hopes.

Among the many important aspects under which the 'Wives of England' may be considered, and under which Mrs. Ellis considers them, the most important is that to which she devotes

her principal attention, and which is suggested by the expression itself. It has often struck us as interesting, that God, in assigning the reason for woman's creation, should have referred alone to her matrimonial relations. Though undoubtedly designed for other purposes by God, still on that occasion he referred alone to the good she should confer on Adam. 'It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him an help meet for him.' Who that has read the history of the world, or only that portion of it contained in the Scriptures, but must perceive at once how full and comprehensive is the meaning of that expression? True it is that woman's influence over man has often been for evil, true it is that the first recorded exercise of Eve's influence was the seduction of Adam, although he was 'not deceived,' from righteousness and God; still, if that influence is great for evil, it is just as great for good, and history and observation support and vindicate the language of her Maker. We believe that a wife is the most potent of all agents for moral good or evil to her husband. The proverbial sayings respecting her power, though often uttered more in joke than in earnest, are substantially correct; they have a truth far deeper than is frequently suspected; and their very commonness is but a testimony to the clearness and universality of the fact which they express. She is adapted, with exquisite wisdom, to be a 'help' for man; though, when foolish or vicious, she can be, just to the same extent, a hindrance, and this in reference to his moral character and spiritual salvation as much as, or more than, anything besides. We are glad, therefore, to be able to say that Mrs. Ellis brings to this part of her subject all that is necessary to its most successful treatment. She has a keen eye and a loving heart. She probes deeply the soul of married life, and supplies wholesome and healthful counsels for its most serious and tender evils. One specimen must suffice of her honesty and wisdom, and a specimen it is likewise of admirable writing. It is on 'Confidence and Truth,' and we commend it to the thoughtful consideration of all *our* readers.

'What, then, of such importance as to obtain the perfect and confiding trust of the companion with whom, or for whom, you have to act in everything you do? and in order to this happy attainment, nothing is so essential as that you should yourself be true.

'There is a spirit of truth and a spirit of falsehood pervading many of those actions, which could not be said to be either true or false in themselves. Yet, according to the choice we make betwixt these, our behaviour will be upright, candid, generous, and free; or it will be servile, artful, selfish, and cowardly. It does not follow, in order to practise falsehood, that we must deviate from the exact letter of truth. There are methods of deceiving, as many, and as various, as the circumstances which chequer our experience every day; and if a consci-

entious adherence to truth is not made the rule of daily life, one act of duplicity will grow out of another, until the whole conduct becomes a tissue of artifice and deceit.

'The first and most innocent step towards falsehood is concealment. Before our common acquaintance, there is wisdom in practising concealment to a certain extent; but where the intimacy is so great, the identity so close, as between a husband and a wife, concealment becomes a sort of breach of faith; and with parties thus situated, the very act of concealment can only be kept up by a series of artful endeavours to ward off suspicion, or observation of the thing concealed.

'Now, when a husband discovers, as in all probability he will, unless these endeavours are carried out to a very great extent,—when he discovers that his wife has been concealing one thing from him, he very naturally supposes that she has concealed many more; and his suspicions will be awakened in proportion. It will then be in vain to assure him that your motive was good, that what you did was only to spare him pain, or afford him pleasure; he will feel that the very act is one which has set him apart in his own house as a stranger, rather than a guardian there—an enemy, rather than a friend.

'Why then should you begin with concealment? The answer, it is to be feared, is but too familiar—'My husband is so unreasonable.' And here then we see again the great advantage of choosing as a companion for life a reasonable man, who may with safety and satisfaction be made acquainted with everything you think or do.

'After concealment has been habitually practised, there follows, in order to escape detection, a system of false pretences, assumed appearances, and secret schemes, as much at variance with the spirit of truth, as the most direct falsehood, and unquestionably as debasing to the mind.

'But, as an almost inevitable consequence, next follows falsehood itself; for what woman would like her husband to know that she had, for days, months, or years, been practising upon his credulity. If he discovers what she has been concealing, he will also discover, that often, when the subject was alluded to, she artfully evaded his questions by introducing another; that sometimes she so managed her voice as to convey one idea, while she expressed another; and that at other times she absolutely *looked* a lie. No, she cannot bear that he should look back and see all this, lest he should despise her; and therefore, in some critical moment, when brought into that trying situation in which she must either confess all, or deny all, she pronounces at last that fatal word, which effectually breaks asunder the spiritual bond of married love.

'And now, it is scarcely possible to imagine a more melancholy situation than that of a weak and helpless woman, separated by falsehood from all true fellowship either human or divine; for there is no fellowship in falsehood. The very soul of disunion might justly be said to be embodied in a lie. It is in fact the sudden breaking asunder of that great chain which binds together all spiritual influences; and she who is guilty of falsehood must necessarily be alone. Alone, for she has

no sympathy of feeling with the beautiful creation around her, of which it has truly been said, that 'nature never deceives;' alone, for in that higher world, where all her secret thoughts and acts are registered, its very light is truth,—alone, for she has voluntarily become a stranger, a suspected thing, an enemy to that one friend in whose bosom she might have found shelter and repose.

'It is a fact which scarcely needs to be repeated, that the closer the intimacy, and the more important the trust, the greater is the individual injury, and consequently the violation of personal feeling, when that trust is abused. Thus when the child is first made to understand that it has been deceived by its mother, the very life of its little soul seems for a moment to be quenched. When the father finds that his prodigal son has but returned to take advantage of his affection and credulity, his wounded spirit sinks, and his weary heart is broken. But when the husband looks with earnest eyes into the countenance whose beauty was once his sunshine; when memory flies back and brings again her plighted vow, with all its treasury of truth; when he thinks of that fond heart which seemed to cling to his in all the guileless innocence of unsophisticated youth—oh, it is horrible 'to be discarded thence,' by the dark demon of distrust perpetually reminding him that the bright and sunny tide of early love, upon which he trusted all the riches of his soul, is but a smiling and deceitful ocean, whose glassy surface at once reflects the hues of heaven and conceals the depths of hell.

'It is impossible to speak in language adequate to the importance of this cause, for by failure in this one point, the whole fabric of connubial affection, which might otherwise be made so influential in the promotion of every kind of good, becomes a heap of ruins, as disgraceful to the deceiver as unsightly to the deceived.'—pp. 126—130.

The following are the titles of the chapters of the work:—'Thoughts before Marriage,' 'The First Year of Married Life,' 'Characteristics of Men,' 'Behaviour to Husbands,' 'Confidence and Truth,' 'The Love of Married Life,' 'Trials of Married Life,' 'Position in Society,' 'Domestic Management,' 'Order, Justice, and Benevolence,' 'Treatment of Servants and Dependents,' 'Social Influence.' Our readers will see from this list, that but few topics can be omitted that are properly included in our author's subject. The book is a guide to all the duties of married life. If, indeed, we are conscious of any defect, we should hint that a fuller assertion and exposition of the necessity of real religion to qualify for that most solemn state would have increased the value of the work. The subject is not forgotten, and what is said upon it is good, but convinced as we are that there may be an amiable and efficient discharge of all the visible and outward obligations of married life, in a mode and from motives which have no connexion with the spiritual renewal and final redemption of the soul, and that nothing but 'obedience of

faith' can make married life a blessing, or prevent its being a curse, considered in relation to the religious sensibilities and future destiny of men, we could have wished a more prominent and special association of the general subject, if not the particular topics of Mrs. Ellis's book, with evangelical principles. We say not this for the sake of professional correctness, nor because we have failed, in obedience to Dr. Johnson's advice, to 'clear our minds from cant,' but from a firm belief that 'godliness is gain,' in the sense of being that, and that alone, which can extract all the good, and avert all the evil, of every sphere and relationship of life. No one is more competent than Mrs. Ellis to vindicate and illustrate this great principle.

The poet of 'Hope' has said that—

> 'The world was sad!—the garden was a wild!
> And man, the hermit, sigh'd—till woman smiled!'

Whatever the literal accuracy of this, the sentiment has more truth than poets often manage to put into their couplets. But if the state of man was 'not good' till God gave him a meet associate in woman, even though possessed of every physical and every religious privilege, it is not difficult to imagine what must be his state now, without the solace of her presence and sympathy. If the 'garden' needed her, the 'wilderness' may well require her. If man, simply as *social*, felt a lack which she only could supply, though he might not be able exactly to define it, how much more would he feel it when the sociality of his nature is connected with all the griefs, and infirmities, and perils of *sin?* 'A wife' is a 'good thing,' and we may add with equal certainty, that whatever tends to improve a wife is a good thing, and for this reason we hope our readers will soon obtain and earnestly read the 'Wives of England.'

Art. VII. 1. *The Question 'Is it the Duty of the Government to Provide the Means of Education for the People?' Examined.* By George Payne, LL.D. London: Gladding.

2. *Factories Education Bill — A Speech upon the subject of the Altered Bill, delivered at the Annual Meeting of the British and Foreign School Society, May* 8, 1843. By Andrew Reed, D.D.

3. *A Letter addressed to a Member of Parliament on the Educational Clauses in Sir James Graham's Amended Factory Bill.*

THE events of the past few weeks have greatly revived our confidence. By a course of events which few amongst us anticipated, and which was at first regarded as ominous only of evil, the dissenting community of Great Britain has been thoroughly aroused.

From one end of the empire to the other, from the Orkneys to the Land's End, the sound of alarm has gone forth, and the hundreds of thousands who have answered to its call have astonished and confounded our opponents. The movement has been at once simultaneous and determined. The old spirit of the puritans has returned to their children, and men in high places are in consequence standing aghast, astonished at what they witness, reluctant to forego their nefarious purpose, yet scarce daring to persist in the scheme.

The movement has been distinguished by many healthful signs, to some of which we must briefly advert, before proceeding to our more immediate object. It is not the result of a compact and efficient organization, betokening rather the predominance of a few, than the deep and stirring conviction of the many. Dissenters have long been reproached with the want of such organization, and the fact of its non-existence must be admitted. All was still and quiet, the calmness of death seemed to prevail, and the few who deeply felt the enormous religious wrongs of the nation, mourned in private, in very bitterness of soul, over the criminal supineness of their brethren. We were drifting in the direction of indifference, and strong conservative tendencies were evinced by some of our leading men. Such was the state of things—with few honourable exceptions—when Sir James Graham's insidious attempt to put down dissent by law, revealed at once the extent of our danger, and caused an instantaneous movement in all parts of the empire, and amongst all classes of nonconformists. In the provinces and in the capital, in the manufacturing and in the agricultural districts, there was but one feeling, a determination, such as Christian men only can form, to bestir themselves vigorously, and for ever, against an encroachment so insidious and foul as to be unparalleled in the history of modern legislation. We have witnessed partial movements before, but never anything like this. All distinctions have been merged, all differences forgotten. Age and youth, the prudent and the rash, the man of principle and the man of practical grievance, the conservative whig and the complete suffrage advocate, London committee men and provincial complainers, Methodists of all grades, and Congregationalists of every school, have combined together to resist the common danger, and thus save from spoliation the ark of the covenant. There is something cheering and healthful in this; something, we confess, that goes beyond our expectation, and constitutes an earnest of what may yet be done.

Another striking feature of the movement—ominous to more classes than one—is the fact clearly elicited in the course of recent events, that the people are in advance of their leaders.

We have attended many public meetings on the *Factories Education Bill*, and in every instance have found that the people were prepared to go beyond their guides, to affirm resolutions much stronger and more sweeping than those submitted for their adoption, and to take up a position in advance of the merely defensive warfare which their leaders have advocated. The sentiments most warmly responded to, most cordially cheered, have been those which involved a denial of the right of government to intrude on the province of education, and which charged the present obnoxious measure directly home upon the unchristian connexion subsisting between the church and the state. Moderate sentiments, as they are falsely termed, have found no response in the hearts of the great mass of our people. Personal respect for their utterers has allowed such sentiments to pass in silence, but the downcast countenance, the compressed lips, the knitted brow with which they have been received, have clearly spoken to the bystanders of the force that was necessary to suppress the rising tokens of disapproval. One thing at least has been established beyond all doubt by recent events, and that is, the mighty power which is in existence, ready to be wielded by christian principle, under the guidance of a clear intellect and a strong and determined judgment. May God, in mercy to the church, speedily raise up men who are equal to the direction of such an agency.

We must advert, before passing on, to another feature of this movement, and that is, its strictly religious character. It has been no noisy and intemperate outbreak, conceived in passion and carried on by questionable means: but has had its origin in the deep religious convictions of the people, and has aimed at the vindication of the liberty of conscience and the protection of the young from the unscriptural and destructive dogmas with which the teaching of the hierarchy is now fraught. The character of the movement has been altogether *unique*. There has been nothing like it in the recent history of our country; nothing which can bear a comparison with its prompt, simultaneous, and determined action. It has sprung from other causes than those which ordinarily move the public, and it will be well for our rulers to bear this in mind. Whether justly or not—and we believe the former—it is the strong conviction of hundreds of thousands of our countrymen, that the government measure, if carried out, will be productive of fearful consequences to the religious interests of the community; that it will serve to substitute error for truth, and to give to the grossest forms of superstition and outward worship, the permanence which is derived from an early occupation of the youthful mind. With this view of its bearing they cannot but regard its operation with alarm, and feel constrained,

by the highest considerations of religious duty, to offer it their strenuous and combined opposition. It is no mere party question in their judgment, but a deadly attack on the interests of personal religion,—an insidious attempt to prevent, by pre-occupation, the youthful mind of this country from being possessed by scriptural views of the truth of God. Hence the movement visible to the eye of the public has been only an outward and visible sign of one of a different order,—one less alarming, it may be, in the gross judgments of earthly rulers, but infinitely more adapted to compass the end designed. The voice of prayer, the earnest supplication of imploring thousands, has ascended to Heaven, and already are there visible in the signs of the times the tokens of a merciful reply. It may comport with the policy of our statesmen to regard such means with contempt, but it augurs ill of their knowledge of human nature, and still worse of their acquaintance with English history. There are no principles which lay hold so firmly of the human heart as those which are of a religious complexion. All ages and all countries have testified to this. There is a power of endurance, of persistive action in them which cannot otherwise be attained, an inextinguishable vitality, which will survive amidst every unpropitious circumstance, and gather new strength and determination from every defeat. We do not therefore fear the abandonment of the ground which has been taken. Men have pledged themselves on their knees, they are under the obligation of a religious oath, and cannot swerve from their purpose without falsifying their profession, and foregoing their hope. The history of the past is confirmatory of the same view; for what but the religious convictions of the puritans, and the self-consecration consequent thereon, determined the issue of the great struggle between Charles and his parliament. Political men are slow to believe what the history of every age is forcing upon them, that religious principles and religious men, though more difficult at first to be moved, are, when once aroused, more certain to accomplish their design. Kept steadily to their purpose by the fixedness of their principles, they are impelled onward by a force which no secular motive could supply, and which no hostile agency can permanently withstand.

Such are some of the features of the movement originated by the Government Education Bill. To this bill we directed the attention of our readers last month, and now return to the subject for the purpose of noting its present aspect, and of proffering such counsel as the case appears in our judgment to require. The original bill has been denounced by 13,766 petitions, an expression of opinion altogether unprecedented, and which ought to have induced a prompt withdrawal of the measure.

The 'Globe' of April the 29th gives the following description of the scene exhibited in the House on the previous evening, and we transfer the account to our pages as worthy of permanent record:—

'The House of Commons last night exhibited a scene which to be fully appreciated required to be witnessed. The 'sacred right of petitioning' was exercised to an extent, both as to the number of petitions presented and the signatures affixed, we believe altogether unprecedented in the history of parliaments. The lobby of the House was crowded with gentlemen having charge of large bales of petitions against the Factory Education Bill, regularly arranged, according to the districts of the country whence they had been forwarded, and indorsed with the aggregate number of signatures to each. These were either waiting for or in search of members who represented those places, or some town or county adjacent, to present them to the House; while multitudes of similar petitions had been transmitted direct to the representatives of the city, town, or county in which the petitioners resided, and were brought down to the House by the members, either in their private carriages or hired cabs. Within the House the scene was most amusing. Members were seen entering from the lobby bearing porters' loads of petitions, or sitting with piles at their feet, or by their side, waiting for their turn to present them in due form. One after another rose, as his name was mentioned by the Speaker, announcing ten—twenty—fifty—one hundred petitions against this generally obnoxious measure. Some of these petitions were signed by thousands of persons protesting against its provisions; that from the *town of Leeds*, presented by Mr. ALDAM — independent of fifty separate petitions from the various dissenting bodies of that town and neighbourhood, presented at previous sittings of the House, all numerously signed—contained 22,000 signatures. Lord WORSLEY presented 369 petitions from places in Lincolnshire and Nottingham, signed by 132,000 persons. Colonel Fox, sixty-four petitions, several of which contained many hundred signatures. Mr. EWART, petitions from Liverpool and parts adjacent, to which 20,000 signatures were affixed. Mr. HAWES presented last night, in addition to very large numbers on preceding evenings, *five hundred* petitions, containing an aggregate of many thousand signatures. In fact, the number of petitions against the bill, presented last night only, could not be less than between three and four thousand; and the number of signatures affixed to them amounted to more than a million and a half. The time for receiving petitions, it will be seen, was extended, to enable members to present the petitions they had then with them in the House.'

If the right of petitioning be of any avail, it ought surely, when so exercised, to have been decisive. But her Majesty's ministers think otherwise. They have been placed in their present position mainly by the church; they are still dependent on her support, and regardless, therefore, of the rights of conscience and the prayers of millions, they persist in a measure by which they

hope to repay their debt. Still it was necessary to preserve some appearance of regard to the prayers of the people, and the bill therefore has been subjected to revision—we cannot say amendment—and in this new form has been again submitted to parliament. In introducing his altered bill, Sir James Graham was compelled to acknowledge that the number of petitions presented against his measure 'had been enormous; indeed, almost without any former precedent.' He endeavoured, of course, to damage the character of these petitions, but was constrained by the overwhelming evidence of the case to admit that, 'on the part of a great portion of the dissenting body of this country, there exists a very unanimous feeling against the educational clauses of the bill.' Instead, however, of meeting this 'very unanimous feeling' by complying with the prayer of the 13,766 petitions which had been presented, her Majesty's Home Secretary thinks it enough to vary the form of his obnoxious clauses, and hopes by so trifling a change to divide, if not to satisfy, the opponents of his measure. What a miserable notion Sir James must have of the intellect of dissenters, to suppose they could be caught by so miserable a device! How utterly incapable he must be of appreciating their motives,—nay, of understanding even their views. But this is not to be wondered at, when honourable members and noble lords who have long been regarded as the allies of dissenters, betray such utter ignorance of the first principles of religious liberty as has been evinced in the course of recent debates. The tone in which Sir James announced his so-called amendments was akin to that which marked his introduction of the original measure. We confess, for ourselves, that it was sickening in the extreme,—a notable instance of the disgusting cant by which our parliamentary debates are so frequently characterized. We are not going to say what we think of the religious, or even of the moral character of our representatives, but we will say that, amongst the many anomalous exhibitions consequent upon the existence of a state church, it is by no means the least repulsive that such men should feel justified,—nay, entitled to profess regard for Christianity, and to discourse respecting it as the fit subject for their legislation. We wonder that, for very shame sake, they are not dumb when her name is mentioned, or her holy presence invoked. Could an impersonation of our faith be visible, with what stern rebuke would she look round upon the men who thus assume to legislate for her welfare, whilst their lives belie her pretensions! The latter part of Sir James Graham's speech was of this sickening order; and when regarded as an attempt to avail himself of the prejudices of his audience, cannot well be described in terms too reprehensible. We are greatly surprised

that so keen-sighted a disputant did not perceive the advantage given to the opponents of his idolized church, by his admission of the gross inefficiency of her ministrations. Here is an establishment with a revenue of several millions, its clergy spread over the land by thousands, and its dignitaries ranking with secular barons, and yet we are told, in the year 1843, after it has existed for centuries, and been professedly labouring to Christianize the people, that a 'great mass of ignorance and infidelity —infidelity, arising, not from the perversion of reasoning powers, but from want of knowing the saving truths of the gospel,' is to be found. How, we ask, is this, if there be any force in the reasonings usually adopted by the advocates of the parliamentary church, if there be any such fitness in its machinery for the end contemplated, as is commonly alleged? But the peroration of the home secretary is too edifying to be omitted, and we therefore give it for the instruction of our readers. We marvel much that with such a bill in his hand he could trust himself to allude even to that charity which 'thinketh no evil.'

'How is it,' asked Sir James, and we thank him for putting the question, 'that in England, the pride of Christendom,—England, the mistress of the seas, that sends forth, with her commerce, her language, her manners, her arts, and, more than all these, her missionaries and her religion, to the utmost parts of the earth—how is it that in the heart of this very country, in this fair England, so great a mass of ignorance and infidelity—infidelity, arising, not from the perversion of reasoning powers, but from want of knowing the saving truths of the gospel—should be found? And how is it, too, that, at the same time, such strife, such anger, should be exhibited in the name of religion? Is it any mark of sincerity, either in churchmen or dissenters, that they should embark in bitter and angry controversy? I say that the great Author of the Christian faith has left mankind, to the latest day, a test by which the sincerity of our feelings may be tried. He has said, 'By this shall men know whether ye are my disciples; if ye love one another.' In the early time, when this small band, with all its privations and its wants, was exposed to every species of suffering, the distinguishing characteristic to which I have referred, attracted the notice of the heathen, and they exclaimed, 'See how these Christians love one another!' In these later days, however, the sceptic may point with scorn and derision at professing Christians, and observe, 'See how these Christians hate and despise each other!' These are the difficulties with which we have to contend; but I ask the House to continue to manifest the spirit in which it received what I before addressed to it, as well as what I have ventured to state on this occasion; and I say, let us in heart and mind act the part of Christian legislators, and evince that we are worthy of our high position. I am aware—for the symptoms are but too evident—that upon this question the waters of strife have overflowed, and now cover the land. This [here

the right honourable baronet placed the modified bill upon the table]—this is my olive branch. I tender it in the hope that it may prove the harbinger of peace; and that, ere long, it will return with glad tidings that the waters of strife have subsided. On the part of the government I tender this peace-offering in the spirit of concord—in the spirit of Christian charity—in the spirit of good will; and I will not yet abandon the hope, that if it be received as such, at least in this House, it will still be possible to effect an object which concerns, in the highest degree, not only the temporal, but the eternal welfare of a great body of our fellow subjects, and which will redound to the lasting renown of this House.'

The alterations to which this speech was introductory, leave all the obnoxious principles of the measure untouched, and even add to the objectionable character of some of its provisions. We are not therefore surprised that they met with an instantaneous and indignant rejection from all sections of the dissenting, and, it gives us much pleasure to add, of the Wesleyan body also. The London Deputies, the Protestant Society for the Protection of Religious Liberty, and the Congregational and Baptist Unions, promptly recorded their judgments on the remodelled bill, and their sentiments were re-echoed through the length and breadth of the land. We should be glad, if our space permitted, to transfer the whole of their resolutions to our pages, but are of necessity restricted to a selection, and take the following, which constitute the second and third of those adopted by the *Congregational Union*, *that* being the most numerous and influential of the protesting bodies named above :—

'2. This assembly perceives the bill remains unaltered in all its arbitrary, unconstitutional character. It still connects with the education of the poor, compulsion, penalty, and a test of qualification for employment; it still creates arbitrary powers for the committee of privy council, and enacts the yet more arbitrary appointments and powers of the clerical trustees; it still provides for parochial taxation without the suffrage of the parishioners; it would still divide and register as distinct, classes of her Majesty's subjects, on account of religious differences, and presents altogether the aspect of the arbitrary and centralizing legislation of the continental states, not the liberal character of British law.

'3. That the objections of this assembly to the bill on religious grounds are unaltered and unalterable. In effect, the bill creates a second religious establishment, with its necessary effects of exclusion, inequality, and injustice; it proposes to provide for the extensive teaching, by funds levied from all, of the church catechism, a formulary to which this assembly entertains the deepest and most decided conscientious objections; it would provide that dissenters shall teach religion to their children when in factory employment, so as to satisfy the requirements of the act; it would further exalt, endow, and

strengthen an establishment already too powerful, and now in a spirit and in a state to render its advancement most unreasonable and perilous; it would strike a fatal blow at that freedom of effort in communicating knowledge in religion, which is prized by this assembly above all price as the glory of their country and the hope of the world; while every objection and alarm felt by this assembly in relation to this particular measure is indefinitely increased, when it is considered as the commencement of legislative interference in affairs too sacred for the force of law and penalty—the duties of parents, the education of children, the religious difference and liberties of the people.'

The course marked out by the Deputies and the Protestant Society for the future action of dissenters, is at once constitutional and decided, marking their deep conviction of the enormity of the threatened wrong, and their determination to use every means within their power to avert so fearful a calamity. Should the crisis come to which their resolutions point,—and Sir James has yet given no intimation of withdrawing the bill,—we trust that they will honestly redeem their pledge. The spirit of the country has been cheered by the earnest and uncompromising character of their resolutions, and bitter indeed will be the disappointment if—should the necessity arise—their actions do not perfectly correspond. We say not this in doubt, but only to impress on them still more deeply the fearful amount of their responsibility. In the meantime, we place on record the resolution of the Deputies:—

'3. That this committee must therefore retain and avow their disapproval of the educational clauses of the Factory Bill. That they will petition the House of Commons that, even in their altered state, those clauses may not be sanctioned by the House; that they will not interfere, nor solicit any members to interfere, for any correction or variation in those clauses, while the Bill shall pass through a committee in that House, leaving to the promoters of the measure all its responsibility and discredit, but will endeavour, by further congregational petitions, to prevent the third reading in the Commons, or any progress in the House of Lords, and will, by loyal addresses to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen, and by every constitutional means, persevere in their endeavours to avert the enactments of a measure which would inflict upon the Protestant Dissenters and Methodists of England and Wales, on the country, and on their descendants in future times, the greatest legislative evil that interested intolerance could have devised, or clerical tyranny in dark and barbarous ages might have gloried to impose.'

Considerable anxiety was for a time felt in some quarters respecting the course which the Wesleyan Methodists would pursue. It was well known that the policy of the government was directed to a separation of them from the other sections of the dissenting body. Their hope was based on the possibility of

disunion; and to this accomplishment, therefore, their arts were directed. Happily, however, the Wesleyans remained faithful, and pronounced upon the 'amended' bill substantially the same judgment as they had passed on its predecessor. They do not, of course, go to the extent of our views on the general subject, but it is enough for our immediate object that they reject the ministerial measure, as fraught alike with civil oppression and religious wrong. The following, constituting the last two of their resolutions, are published under date of the 10th of May:

'5. That this committee regarding compulsory payments for the support of religion as contrary to the principles of truth and righteousness taught in the Holy Scriptures, for the same reason it also highly disapproves of levying any rate or tax appropriated to the purpose of supporting schools, in which the scholars are to be taught the catechism, creed, or other formularies, or the tenets of any particular church, or in which the minister of any such church shall be entitled to exclusive or pre-eminent authority, as to the communication of religious instruction; this committee, therefore, regards the provisions of the bill, by which taxes may be levied for this purpose, deserving of unmingled condemnation.

'6. That although this committee most earnestly desires that the advantages of a sound secular and religious education should be universally diffused, yet, as it firmly believes that the educational clauses of the bill are most unconstitutional and unjust, and would, if enforced, deprive many poor persons of some of their dearest, social, civil, and religious liberty; and would be to all classes of dissenters highly obnoxious and oppressive, and produce general dissatisfaction and alarm, which could only be removed by the repeal of the bill: believing also, that the bill, if enacted, would impede rather than advance the progress of education, this committee therefore most earnestly recommends that the most vigorous and persevering efforts be immediately put forth to oppose the bill by every constitutional means, and in its every stage—that public meetings be held to explain the objectionable clauses of the bill—and that petitions be sent from every congregation and school in our connexion, earnestly imploring the House of Commons that the educational clauses may be utterly expunged, or the bill entirely rejected. And this committee further recommends, that the petitions should, if possible, be presented to the House on or before the 22nd instant, when the bill is again to come under its consideration; or if in some instances this is found to be impracticable, then, at all events, before it comes on for the third reading.'

It will not be expected that we should dwell much on the specific objections lying against the 'amended' provisions of the government bill. They have been largely insisted on through the medium of the press and at the various public meetings which for some time past have been daily held through the country. Our readers are well acquainted with them, and we may there-

fore spare ourselves the trouble of recapitulating them at large. To one or two, however, we will just advert. In the first place we are glad to find that the committee of the Sunday-school Union has at length broken its somewhat suspicious silence by recording its judgment on the general character of the measure, and more particularly its bearing on the schools under their care. The following resolution, adopted with several others, expresses the view of the committee on the latter point, and may suffice us in reference to this feature of the case:

'1. That while this committee would acknowledge, that in the altered 'Factories Bill' the clause compelling attendance on such schools upon Sundays has been withdrawn, they conceive that it would be a perilous delusion to imagine that the bill is thereby materially amended. The principle of a paid agency in Sunday-schools they believe to be unsuited for the attainment of their most important objects. For the quantity, quality, or efficiency of the religious and moral education that would be given in the Sunday-schools created by this bill, there is no sufficient guarantee. The existence of such schools under the influences and with the wealth and power with which they would be invested, would still be injurious, if not ruinous, to existing Sunday-schools. Thus the public benefits resulting from such a legislative enactment would be doubtful, but its evil results, certain.'

In the mode of management devised by the bill, considerable alterations have been effected, the tendency of which is greatly to strengthen the objections previously entertained. Dr. Reed has put this matter clearly and forcibly, and we avail ourselves of his reasoning. After stating that a seat at the board of trustees, though not a vote, is given to the government inspector, he adds—

'The next arrangement is, that the clergyman, *ex officio*, shall be a member of the board, and chairman. The next is, that this clergyman shall appoint a second trustee, of course his friend, to sit with him at that board. The next is, that those who subscribe liberally to the erection or support of the school, shall return one member to that board; and, as these schools are to be regulated strictly on the principles of the church, he will, of course, be a churchman. Then four other persons are to become trustees; and these four persons are to be chosen by the rate-payers; but so to be chosen as that no person can vote for more than two, and therefore there will be, by necessity, a majority choosing two, and the minority choosing two. This might seem to make a provision for the dissenters in all cases. As machinery, you will think this laborious and clumsy. All these arrangements are in reference to a particular parochial school; it has nothing of simplicity in it, and I think in the working it would be found almost impracticable.

'But I am not now speaking so much to the wisdom of the arrangement as to the honesty and integrity of it. It seems to provide, with a great air of liberality, that the dissenter in every case shall have a seat, and shall utter a voice, but, at the same time it takes care that there shall be an impossibility of the dissenting voices ever becoming a majority in that board. Under the former arrangement there was just a possibility that, if the dissenters were strong, they might secure to themselves a majority, and express there a controlling opinion. This might have happened in many of the manufacturing districts. It might happen, that a churchwarden might be a dissenter, although there is strange inconsistency in such an association. It might happen that mill-owners might be returned who were dissenters; and in Manchester I happen to know that the majority of mill-owners are dissenters; therefore the likelihood would have been that, in such a place as Manchester, the return might have been occasionally in favour of the non-conformists. But now it is impossible. The arrangement is so complete, and I will venture to say, so subtle, as entirely to exclude the dissenting voice from any control at any time in the proceedings. Who would, as a dissenter, sit at a board where he had no chance of expressing an opinion that could by any possibility prevail? I call this playing a game with loaded dice—a profession of liberality which has nothing of reality in it; and I had much rather that a measure should be proposed, in plain, distinct terms, to deprive us of a right, than to make a parade of giving what in fact is meant to be withheld. I denounce this portion of the measure, therefore, as unworthy of statesmen—as an insult to the character of Englishmen—which, whatever may be its blemishes, has never been charged with the want of truthfulness and honesty.'—pp. 3—5.

The mastership of these schools will necessarily be in the hands of the church, since each appointment is to be recognised by the bishop of the diocese, and as the assistants to the master are to be appointed by the trustees, they will certainly be of the same religious complexion. A new test act will thus be devised, as unjust in principle, and as offensive and vexatious in operation, as any which the intolerant bigotry of a former age has framed. No matter what may be the qualifications of a dissenting teacher, he neither can accept, nor, if willing to do so, would he be able to obtain, such a post. He may be virtuous, intelligent, and pains-taking, but the sanction of the bishop he could not obtain, and the unscriptural dogmas of the state-church he would be unwilling to teach. 'The probability is,' as the authors of *A Letter to a Member of Parliament* remark, 'that the masters will very generally be curates of the established church, and that thus one step will be made towards the enforcement of that part of the seventy-eighth ecclesiastical canon, which enacts that 'a licence to teach youth of the parish be granted to none, but only to the said curate.''

What may be the fate of this measure we know not. The

ministry have yet stood by it, notwithstanding the millions who have craved its rejection, and may possibly continue to do so. Doggedly bent on the adoption of their scheme, regardless alike of the sacredness of conscience and the testimony of history, deaf to all entreaties, and unmindful of every obligation, save those of faction, they may resolve to persevere. Should they do so,—and we are by no means certain they will not,—such a spirit will be raised in this country as no generation has witnessed since the atrocities of Laud alienated the popular mind from the hierarchy, and paved the way for its overthrow. It may struggle on a short time longer, but if there be faith in men, and force in righteous principles, it will speedily be overthrown amidst the indignant execration of an outraged people. The Ministry cannot be ignorant of the feeling of the country. It has been spoken out in tones not to be misunderstood, and is daily gathering strength. The 'sacred right of petitioning' has been exercised to an unprecedented extent, and tens of thousands are yet pressing forward to swell the ranks of opposition. The character of the petitioners gives weight to their prayer. Whatever high churchmen may think of their ecclesiastical status, even their enemies will not venture to deny—such of them at least as retain one particle of candour—that, taken as a whole, they belong to the soundest, the most healthful, the most moral portion of the community. In June, 1839, the *Standard* boasted that 3,091 petitions, whose signatures did not amount to 40,000, had been presented against the education scheme of Lord Melbourne's government, and appealed to this fact as decisive against the measure; and yet the Conservative administration of 1843 can persist, up to this moment, in a bill, the rejection of which has been solicited by millions of earnest and intelligent petitioners. We wait the issue with confidence, assured that, whatever may be its immediate complexion, its ultimate tendencies are fraught with good.

In the meantime, it becomes us to examine and sift well our views, to look to the ground we have taken up, to ascertain the value as well as the truth of our principles, and to familiarize ourselves with the possibility of being speedily called on to sacrifice much in their defence. So far as the educational question is concerned, we have been gratified to observe the right direction of the popular mind. Everywhere, and on all occasions, this has been visible, nor have indications been wanting of the growing enlightenment of our more influential men on this point. The following resolution, adopted at the annual session of the *Baptist Union*, in April last, though not repudiating state grants for educational purposes, bespeaks a gratifying approximation to the whole truth:

'That the Union feel it their duty to declare that they do not consider the education of the community to be the proper business of the government. They hold, on the contrary, that because it is beyond the just province of civil government, and because it cannot fail to influence religious opinions, popular education ought not to be interfered with by the state in any way of direction or control; all such interference being inconsistent with the right of private judgment, and the permission of it affording an indirect sanction to the antichristian principle of ecclesiastical establishments.'

Dr. Payne's pamphlet, which we have placed at the head of this article, and which—excepting the last page—we have read with no ordinary pleasure, is a well-timed and invaluable contribution to the general cause. It is written with earnestness, yet never fails in discretion; is clear and decided in its principles, yet perfectly free from bitterness; is logical, without being dry, and courteous, without suppression of the truth. The object of the bill is thus described, and we beseech our readers to keep the fact in mind.

'It is amazing to me that it should ever have been introduced—that any bill at all to secure the education of the operative classes should have emanated from the men to whom it owes its parentage—but preeminently such a bill! Amazing, I mean, that there should have existed in any quarter the slightest expectation of cajoling the country into the acceptance of such a bill. For what is its object? Evidently to recover for the church its lost ground in the country, by taking the young under its fostering care, and by forming a second established church for them, to preserve them from that awful apostasy (to dissent) from which its originators are hopeless of reclaiming their parents. Its object is to close the doors of all the existing dissenting schools,—to extinguish dissent itself,—and to force back again, by indirect and Jesuitical means, those wanderers from the fold of the establishment who would never voluntarily return! It aims to do all this also in violation of the constitution which permits and sanctions dissent;—and, what would be very amusing, did it not involve injustice and legalized robbery, it seeks to make *dissenters* the means of doing all this. It seeks to convert them into religious suicides, by forcing them to contribute to an uncontrolled amount—in violation of the constitution—to the support of measures designed and adapted to destroy them and their principles for ever! And while announcing the design to perpetrate this monstrous wrong upon dissenters, the supporters of the measure have the face gravely to ask us, 'How can you be dissatisfied with so excellent a bill?''—pp. 3, 4.

Dr. Payne is a strenuous opponent of the interference of government with education, any further than the granting of pecuniary aid in support of the *secular* instruction supplied in schools originated by voluntary and benevolent exertions. We

confess, for ourselves, that we cannot perceive the consistency of much of our author's reasoning with such an admission, and we respectfully solicit his serious attention to the apparent discrepancy. We are the more surprised at his setting this limitation to his views, from the clear and unembarrassed manner in which his general reasonings are prosecuted. In the following passage, Dr. Payne confirms the view which we expressed last month, and we are glad to adduce the sanction of so respectable an authority:—

'My present concern is, however, with the assertion that it is the *duty* of government to furnish the means of education for the people—a duty springing out of the relation in which it stands to the people. This, I acknowledge, I more than doubt. The work of education seems to me to be altogether *ultra vires* of government, to be beyond its legitimate province; it is not *the* work that government was instituted to accomplish; it is as little the proper business and duty of the civil government to educate the people, as to supply them with work and food. The legitimate office of the civil governor is to defend our natural and civil rights. Without government, every person would be obliged to defend his person, his life, limbs, property, &c., in the best way he could. After the establishment of government, the right of defence is, for the most part, transferred to those in whom the supreme power is vested; but, strictly speaking, nothing else is transferred. Civil government is instituted to do this *one* thing, and nothing else. It acts within its proper province only when it frames and executes laws to secure us in the possession and exercise of those natural rights of which the very existence of government implies the personal surrender. If it move a step beyond this point, it is acting *ultra vires* of its office; and, without venturing to assert that it ought never to do this, I will add that it should never be done but under the impulse of necessity,—since every institution, in every country, has been invariably *found* to secure the largest amount of benefit to the country *when it has kept within its province.* The complaint of some is, that government does not do enough; the true ground of complaint is, that it has attempted to do too much. Over-legislation is the great evil to be avoided: we are sure to have enough of it. Had the government of this country possessed the wisdom to let many things with which they have interfered alone, our commerce, and our religion, and our national character, would have been the gainers by it. Statesmen have yet to learn the lesson, '*Do not intermeddle.*'"—pp. 8, 9.

Again he argues, in confirmation of the same view,—

'If it be the duty of government, on the ground alleged, to take the work of education into its own hands, there are ten thousand other things with which it might interfere, and, indeed, must interfere and subject to its control. The argument is this, government must educate the people to preserve their civil rights intact,—to preserve them from that aggression and violence which are, sometimes at least,

the result of ignorance. Now every one must see, on reflection, that this argument is invalid unless it will bear to be generalized,—or, to express the same thing in more logical terms,—unless the implied major premiss be true. It cannot be the duty of the civil magistrate to educate on the ground that it tends to uphold civil rights, unless it be his duty to do everything that possesses the same tendency. This it is impossible to admit. Its admission would let in the interference of the secular power where every one feels it ought not to enter,—(yea, in what would it shut it out?)—into the mode of conducting business, the management of domestic concerns, &c. It might fix the style of living of our merchants and tradesmen, the expenses of families, for lavish expenditure often leads to dishonesty and robbery. If you once allow the civil magistrate to go beyond the legitimate boundary, to enforce measures which he may happen to think tend to preserve civil rights from acts of aggression, and do not confine him to the punishment of the *overt acts* themselves, where is he to stop? What is to prevent his legislating about everything? Civil government, if thus exercised, would become an intolerable nuisance. The directions and commands of law would, like the plague of frogs, come into our houses, and into our bed-chambers, and into our ovens and our kneading-troughs. The civil governor is to direct the threatenings of law against *acts* which directly infringe upon civil rights, and he is farther to execute these threatenings, but he is to go no further.' —pp. 11, 12.

Against the interference of government with the *religious* instruction of the people, Dr. Payne reasons with a directness and force which are truly refreshing. His argument is of comprehensive bearing, and is susceptible of manifold other applications than that which is now uppermost in the popular mind. What will the advocate of church-rates say to the following? For ourselves, we confess that, if this reasoning be correct—and we have no doubt on the point,—we cannot see the propriety of paying such an impost.

'Besides, the compulsory support of religion is at variance with the very nature of religion. Every religious service and offering must be voluntary, to be accepted of God. Every payment to the support of religion extorted by the strong hand of the government—especially if applied to the support of what is false in religion—is a vile oblation in the sight of God. He will accept the free-will offering only. He looks at the *heart*, not at the silver and the gold; the *former* is the offering. When, by the compulsion of law, even great wealth is placed upon God's altar, there is no *offering*—nothing for him to accept; and he may be expected to say to the extorters of such an oblation, 'Who hath required this at your hands?'

'On this ground, I should totally disapprove of any law rendering the support of religion compulsory, even if the sovereign and the country held precisely the same religious faith. There would not then, indeed, exist *the* evil, perhaps we may say, *the* GREAT evil, that

exists now—'the evil of multitudes' being compelled to support what they deem false, perhaps dangerous, in religion; but there would exist the evil of compulsory support. And this is, of itself, of appalling magnitude—an evil which tends to corrupt the very principle of obedience, by substituting the authority of man for the authority of God. It also assumes authority, on the part of man, where there is none. God has set me free from human control in reference to the support of religion. I am bound to *him* to support it, but not to man. And he has thus left all men free, that their contributions and their services may do honour to him, flowing, as they may then appear to do, from unmingled, as well as reverential regard to his authority. God has a right to control conscience,—man none at all.'—pp. 26, 27.

But it is not on the education question only that we are anxious to see our friends take up right and tenable ground. The present measure is but an *effect*, of which the state church is the *cause*, and to the constitution and working of that church our attention must be directed, if we would permanently guard ourselves from the monstrous injustice with which we are threatened. Neither civil nor religious equality can be secured while the present alliance subsists between the church and the state. Such equality we claim as our right. We ask no more, we will not be content with less: but in order to its attainment,—and to this we crave the attention of our readers,—the predominance of the state sect must be terminated. We do not seek—whatever Lord Brougham in his folly may allege—sectarian triumphs in preference to works of charity, but we are not willing, even at the bidding of his lordship and his new-made friends, to allow the old enemies of English liberty to effect a triumph against which our fathers contended at the cost of life. Sir James Graham has affirmed that equality we are not to have. He has taken off the mask, and we thank him for doing so. His declaration precludes all doubt, and renders our course both simple and obvious. The present bill is but one of many evils flowing from the unchristian connexion which subsists between the church and the state, and if abandoned, it will only be for a time, and in hope of a more favourable opportunity. We are therefore shut up to one course. Self-preservation and religious duty alike enjoin it, and the sooner we look it fairly in the face the better. Dr. Payne adverts to this necessity, and we commend his reasoning to the attentive consideration of dissenters.

'If,' he remarks, 'in reply to the previous reasoning—designed to shew that no man can be righteously compelled to support and extend religious principles which he considers at variance with the Bible,—it should be said, that because we have an established church in this country, government is bound to teach in the pulpit, and in the school, the religious principles of that church, I answer that, if the conclusion be

not a gross *non sequitur*, (which it may be, for the argument to a dissenter is, 'because we have one evil in the country, we must have another,') I must assail the premises. I am compelled to take my ultimate position, and to say that, in that case, we must not have an established church. Great as the blessing of an established church may be in the eyes of many, I am constrained to think it a far worse evil to have an established church—if it cannot be had (and I frankly say I think it cannot)—without the essential injustice of compelling multitudes to contribute to the support and extension of a religious faith which they deem unscriptural, and without the pressure upon conscience, of which so much has been said—than to have no established church at all. Most inexpedient is it, in Sir James Graham, as a friend of the church, to press the adoption of his bill. It will inflict what millions think a great evil upon the country; and these millions will reason backwards from the evil *before* to the evil *behind;* from that which is about to burst upon us, '*monstrum horrendum,*' to that which already *exists.* Were I a friend of the established church, or rather of the establishment of that church—for to the episcopalian denomination I would cherish every sentiment of good will—I should ask myself, whether the bill of Sir James did not peril the very existence of the present establishment. Dangerous no doubt it is to the establishment that so many have left her camp, and formed themselves into independent, if not rival and hostile, bodies; but ten thousand times more dangerous would it be if, because we have one established church, we must have another, a second established church, for the children of the country—a church, not supported by its own funds, as is sometimes said of the present, but formed by the creation of new funds, and likely to diminish the scanty pittance now afforded to the poor.'—pp. 27, 28.

We shall return to this point again, and that at no distant period. At present we have to do with *the bill,* and are concerned specially to guard our friends against the false confidence which may be attendant on its abandonment. As already remarked, that abandonment, even if it occur, which we greatly doubt, will be only temporary. Church priests are resolved to get the education of the people into their hands, and the Tory party are too dependent on church support to refuse their request. This is not all, nor is it the worst feature of the case. Many of our liberal politicians are disposed to yield much in the same direction. Grossly ignorant, or only partially informed on all points relating to religion, they are willing to sacrifice the cause of liberty in order to promote that of education. It may be, that the recent agitation of the question out of doors will enlighten some of our senators, but at present there are few men in parliament to whom we can safely trust the exposition or the advocacy of our principles. The Whigs have failed, notoriously failed, at the great crisis. We are not un-

mindful of what they have done, neither do we confound them with their Tory opponents; but the times have advanced beyond them; their creed is unsuited to the exigencies of the day, and we must look out for other friends if we would have justice done to us within the Commons' house. Our great reliance, under God, must be upon ourselves: upon our clear, well-defined, and consistent principles, our unwearied activity, our firmness of purpose, and Christian consecration. Let every congregation and Sunday school petition; let public meetings be held in every place, and communications be opened with every representative. Above all, let fervent and effectual prayer be addressed to Him in whose hands are the hearts of all men, and we may yet be spared from the evils which threaten us, and protect our country from the terrible calamity which the success of our opponents would inflict. 'It is quite enough to suffer the continuance of *old* institutions, founded upon an order of arbitrary distinctions and exclusions. That *new* ones should be framed on the same principles, yet professedly for the general good, and empowered to exact support indiscriminately from all, is to be protested against by every liberal mind.' *

We stop the press to introduce the following extract from the 'Morning Chronicle' of the 27th of May, from which our readers will learn that the Factories Bill is deferred till after the holidays. Let dissenters continue their vigilance and firmness, and they may yet triumph; but their cause, or rather, that of religious freedom, is lost, if they permit themselves to be deluded into a false security.

'Mr. LAMBTON wished to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether it was the intention of Government to withdraw the educational clauses of the Factories Bill?

'Sir JAMES GRAHAM said it was not his intention, on the part of her Majesty's Government, to propose any further progress with this bill until after the Whitsuntide recess; but it was the intention of Government to take the sense of the House on those clauses.

'Mr. HAWES asked whether he meant to propose the clauses as they now stood?

'Sir JAMES GRAHAM said it was not in his power to make any alteration in them.

'In reply to a question from Mr. HAWES,

'Sir JAMES GRAHAM stated, that before the commencement of the Whitsuntide recess he should mention the precise day on which he would bring the Factories Bill before the House.'

* Foster's Popular Ignorance.

Brief Notices.

A Dictionary, Geographical, Statistical, and Historical, of the various Countries, Places, and Principal Natural Objects in the World. Illustrated with Maps. By J. R. M'Culloch, Esq. 2 vols. London: Longman and Co.

Few works are more useful than a well arranged and accurate geographical dictionary, and few men probably could be found so competent to the production of such a work as Mr. M'Culloch. His extensive and multifarious information, his unwearied industry, his singular powers of condensation, and great facility of arrangement, constitute a pre-eminent fitness for such an undertaking, and fully warrant the confidence with which the public are disposed to receive his labours. His trustworthiness has been tested by other and analogous productions, so that the present work is ushered into notice under circumstances the most auspicious. The geographical dictionaries hitherto furnished to the English reader have been notoriously deficient in pains-taking and accuracy. They have been mere compilations, hastily put together, without discrimination or sound criticism, and have failed to supply the reader with any references which might enable him to correct the blunders made. To supply the deficiency thus existing in our literature has been the object proposed by Mr. M'Culloch in the work before us, and his success has been complete. He has not attempted to supply his reader with a *complete* geographical, statistical, and historical dictionary, but has omitted unimportant places and objects, in order that he might more fully describe such as are of general importance and interest. 'It has been our object,' he remarks in his preface, 'by excluding articles and statements of little interest, to keep our work within reasonable limits, and to allow, at the same time, sufficient space for treating the more important articles at adequate length. It is also necessary to bear in mind, that this being a work for the especial use of Englishmen, we have dwelt at the greatest length on the articles and details we presumed most likely to interest them. Hence we have appropriated a much larger space to a description of our eastern possessions and of our colonies in different parts of the world than they may appear on other grounds properly entitled to. On the same principle, we have lengthened the accounts of those countries and places with which our countrymen have the greatest intercourse, or which have acquired celebrity by the historical associations connected with them, and have proportionally shortened the others.' The *political* geography, comprising the industry, institutions, and condition of the inhabitants of the countries described, has engaged considerable attention, and is illustrated by a mass of information which no other man could have furnished, and the value of which it is impossible to estimate too highly. This is connected with brief historical notices, together with discussions, more or less

extended, on the influences exerted by institutions and habits on the welfare of nations. In such a work, minute errors cannot fail to exist, which subsequent revision will easily correct; but as a whole, it is entitled to the very highest praise, and is deserving of the largest patronage. No library, public or private, can be complete without it, and no intelligent Englishman, whose means place it within his reach, will fail to secure to himself the benefits of an easy access to its richly furnished pages. The work contains a prodigious amount of valuable matter, printed in double columns, in a small but clear type, and is contained in two thick volumes octavo.

'Enter into thy Closet;' or, Secret Prayer and its accompanying Exercises, intended to assist Young Persons and others in acquiring devotional Habits, without the aid of written Forms. By the Rev. James M'Gill, Hightae, Lochmaben. Glasgow: Bryce; London: Hamilton and Adams.

A little work very likely to accomplish the purpose for which it is designed. It treats of prayer under the heads of adoration, confession, petition, thanksgiving, self-dedication, and intercession, and contains a chapter on each of these, with some few others on kindred subjects. The theology is sound and scriptural, and the style simple and clear.

War and Peace: The evils of the first, and a plan for preserving the last. By William Jay. London: Ward and Co.

A pamphlet issued under the auspices of the London Peace Society, and prefaced by introductory observations by the late excellent secretary of that body. It is from the pen of the Hon. Judge Jay, the author of 'Slavery in America.' It comprises a judicious and temperate exposure of the evils of war, illustrated by reference to facts, in the history of the United States, and the kingdoms of the Eastern Continent, and suggests a plan for their prevention, in a system of national arbitration, which may prepare the way for a future congress of nations. There is throughout the whole pamphlet valuable information, an exposition of lofty principles and views, and a great amount of practical wisdom.

The Poetical Works of John Milton. With a Memoir and Critical Remarks on his Genius and Writings. By James Montgomery. 2 vols. London: Tilt and Bogue.

We are glad to find on our table such an edition of the poetical works of John Milton. It speaks well for the condition of the public mind, and strengthens our confidence in its healthfulness and increasing vigour. We are not, of course, about to enter on the critical investigation of Milton's merits as a poet. It is enough for our purpose to express satisfaction in the appearance of such an edition as

the present, and to lay before our readers a brief account of its peculiarities. The typography is beautiful, just such as accords with our notions of what is due to the great poet, whilst the illustrations, which are one hundred and twenty in number, are from drawings which bespeak, on the part of Mr. Harvey, a more intimate sympathy than is usually evinced by artists with their author. Some of these are exceedingly striking and beautiful, though, in many cases, it is impossible to avoid the conviction that the very nature of the subjects sought to be illustrated, places them beyond the legitimate province of art. They are too refined and ethereal, too vast, impalpable, and undefined; partake, in a word, too exclusively of the qualities of pure spirit, to be brought within the scope, or be made subject to the control, of the painter. Still Mr. Harvey has done much, and we thank him for the service.

The brief Memoir, with strictures on the genius and writings of Milton, which Mr. Montgomery has furnished, is just such a sketch as we should have looked for from his pen, and cannot fail to be heartily welcomed by an extensive circle of readers. It is the production of an intelligent, discriminating, and sympathetic critic, one who has shared the inspiration of Parnassus, and can therefore commune with the inward and living spirit which spoke in strains so unearthly

> 'Of Man's disobedience, and the fruit
> Of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste
> Brought death into the world, and all our woe.'

The Memoir is very brief, supplying merely an outline of the poet's life, without taking note, or expressing any opinion on the great questions, political or religious, which absorbed so much of Milton's time and solicitude. These, it is obvious, have been intentionally avoided, and the *Memoir* is, in consequence, deficient in that interest for which most readers will look. The volumes are 'got up' with great elegance, and will form an appropriate ornament to the drawing-room as well as to the library table.

The Christian Philosopher; or the Connexion of Science and Philosophy with Religion. Illustrated with Engravings. By Thomas Dick, LL.D. Eighth edition, revised, corrected, and greatly enlarged. Glasgow: William Collins.

On the Old and New Covenants. By David Russell, D.D. Second edition, much enlarged. Glasgow: James Maclehose.

New and greatly improved editions of two works, which are well deserving of the reputation they have acquired. Dr. Dick has carefully revised the whole of his volume, and made considerable additions to some of its departments. The article on 'Geology' has been enlarged to more than double its former extent, and several others, such as geography, astronomy, and natural philosophy, have received considerable additions. New topics have also been introduced, arising out of recent discoveries in various departments of science and art.

In Dr. Russell's volume also, considerable enlargements have been introduced, 'chiefly in the discussions respecting the Jewish theocracy, the Levitical priesthood and festivals, and the reign of Christ in the kingdoms of providence and grace.' The effect of these additions is to render the important discussions contained in the volume both more lucid and more satisfactory.

Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature. By John Kitto, Editor of 'The Pictorial Bible,' &c. Assisted by various Scholars and Divines. Parts I. and II. Edinburgh: A. and C. Black.

It is with great pleasure that we introduce this work to the favourable notice of our readers. The admirable character of Mr. Kitto's former publications led us to rejoice at the first announcement of his being engaged in its preparation. We have long needed such a work, and the advanced state of biblical literature furnishes ample materials for its completion. There is no man living—we say so with entire sincerity—to whom we could trust with so much confidence, as to Mr. Kitto, for a judicious and effective distribution of such materials, and it is therefore with no ordinary satisfaction that we receive from him this new contribution to a cause which he has already so ably served. The literary aid secured, while it will relieve himself from what would otherwise have proved a most onerous and overwhelming labour, will secure to the public the contributions of Biblical scholars, antiquarians, and naturalists, of the highest eminence. The initials of the several writers will be appended to their articles, thus affording all reasonable assurance that their papers will be 'alike worthy of public confidence, and of their own literary reputation.' The plan of the work, in addition to the new matter introduced, is thus stated by the editor :—

1. Biblical Criticism, embracing the History of the Bible Languages —The Canon of Scripture—Literary History and Peculiarities of the Sacred Books—Formation and History of the Texts of Scripture. 2. Biblical Interpretation, comprehending the principles of translating and expounding Scripture—Critical Estimate of the leading Interpreters and principal Versions, Ancient and Modern. 3. History—Proper Names of Persons—Biographical Sketches of the more prominent characters—Detailed Accounts of the principal events recorded in Scripture—Chronology and Genealogy of Scripture. 4. Geography. —Names of Places—Description of Scenery—Boundaries and mutual relations of the Countries mentioned in Scripture, so far as necessary to illustrate the Sacred Text. 5. Archæology.—Manners and Customs of the Jews and other Nations mentioned in Scripture—Their Sacred Institutions—Their Military Affairs—Their Political Arrangements —Their Literary and Scientific Pursuits. 6. Physical Science.— Scripture Cosmogony and Astronomy — Zoology — Mineralogy — Botany—Meteorology.

The work will be principally occupied with matters which find no adequate place in other works, whilst many topics of considerable general importance will be noticed only in the relations which they

sustain with the History, Antiquities, and Literature of the Bible. Persons and places of whom nothing is recorded worthy of note, will be excluded from the body of the work, and the alphabetical series of words will be arranged on a greatly improved plan. The historical mode of treatment will be adopted in the case of theological disquisition, and in addition to numerous maps, the work will be profusely illustrated with engravings, both on steel and wood. It is printed in double columns, in a neat and clear type, will appear in monthly parts, price two shillings and sixpence each, and is intended to form one handsome octavo volume. Whether, therefore, we regard the well-earned reputation of the author, the plan of his present work, the literary talent combined on it, or the earnest supplied in the two Parts now before us, we feel authorized to express a decided and far more earnest approval than is usual with us.

The Home; or, Family Cares and Family Joys. By Frederika Bremer. Translated by Mary Howitt. 2 vols. London :—Longman and Co.

We are not surprised to find that the former work of Miss Bremer, entitled 'The Neighbours,' which we noticed in terms of deserved commendation at the time of its appearance, has met with a warm reception from the English public. It well deserved such treatment, and cannot fail to secure a favourable attention to the volumes now on our table. 'As 'The Neighbours,' remarks Mrs. Howitt, 'might be regarded as a salutary picture of new married life, 'The Home,' I think, will be found equally charming and useful as a picture of family life during the growth of children—a sketch of home discipline in which is seen how, without great worldly fortune or extraordinary events, a deep interest may gather about a group of individuals ; and how faults and failings, and diversity of dispositions, which, without the great saving principles, would lead to sorrow and disunion, are by these saving principles, love and good sense, made to work themselves out, and leave behind them a scene of harmony, affection, and moral culture, most charming to contemplate.' The present work is wanting in some of the elements of deep and impassioned interest which characterized its predecessor; yet it has a charm of its own of no ordinary power, which sustains attention, enkindles solicitude, and gratifies the purest of our social affections. Ernst Frank, with his high principles, sound sense, and deep feeling, couched beneath a cold exterior, with Elise, his beautiful and loving wife, partaking largely of the virtues of her sex; their eldest and only boy Henrik, the mother's 'summer child,' a fine intelligent youth, full of life, but destined to an early grave, with their four daughters, each distinguished from the other, and all presenting, whether apart or in combination, a mixture of qualities adapted to awaken both the pride and the apprehension of their parents, constitute a group, the like of which may occasionally be seen, and which, when once beheld, can never be forgotten. Other personages are introduced, some of whom act an important and not un-

interesting part, as Jacobi, the tutor and friend of Henrik, Mrs. Gunilla, a kind-hearted, yet somewhat querulous lady, friend of the family, and Assessor Munter, a perpetual grumbler, who yet knew what warm affections were. Our young friends—and, if we mistake not, many old ones too—will find these volumes full of interest, and it will not be the fault of the fair author if the effect of their perusal be not to strengthen domestic affections, and to correct many evils by which the happiness of home is impaired.

Annotations on the Pentateuch, or the Five Books of Moses; the Psalms of David; and the Song of Solomon. Part XIV. By Henry Ainsworth. Glasgow: Blackie and Son.

The rising ministry are deeply indebted to Messrs. Blackie, for placing the 'Annotations' of Henry Ainsworth within their reach. The work has hitherto been inaccessible to the great majority of our ministers, but may now happily be obtained, at a small comparative cost, by all who are desirous of benefiting by its extensive, varied, and profound scholarship. To praise such a work is unnecessary, and it will augur ill for the character of our ministry, if the present reprint does not find an extensive sale. It is now completed in two neat volumes, and should find its place amongst the most cherished companions of those who are engaged in expounding the divine oracles. 'That such a production, justly prized by foreigners, should have been comparatively overlooked by British scholars, is assuredly not creditable to the country which gave the author birth. This edition, being much more accurate and elegant than any of its predecessors, will, we fondly trust, meet with that encouragement which it really merits. Ainsworth's translation—for the learned Brownist gives a new version also with his 'Annotations'—is often peculiarly happy, and, as observed long since by the excellent Doddridge, is superior in several instances to our authorized version. The notes, displaying rare erudition, abound in judiciously selected and valuable illustrations of Scripture from the Rabbinical comments.'

The Holy Bible, containing the Old and New Testaments, Translated out of the Original Tongues, [the authorized translation] accompanied throughout with a brief Hermeneutic and Exegetical Commentary and Revised Version. By the Rev. T. J. Hussey, D.D., Rector of Hayes, Kent. Parts I.—III. London: Colburn.

This new edition of the Bible comes before us with all the sanction which can be derived from its editor being a clergyman of the church of England, and its being dedicated to the highest dignitaries of the church, the Archbishops of Canterbury and Armagh. The authorized version, with the parallel passages and marginal readings, is given entire on one side of each page, whilst the other contains the new renderings of the editor, together with additions from the Samaritan Pentateuch, and other versions, and brief explanatory

notes, incorporated in the manner of a paraphrase. We are not by any means disposed to object to this arrangement, though we are very little influenced by the reason by which Dr. Hussey vindicates his making the authorized version the basis of his commentary—'the paramount sanction of the church, impressed upon that most noble monument of human learning and piety.' It would be premature, with so small a portion of the work before us, to offer any critical remarks on particular passages. We need only say at present, that though we have noticed some alterations which we do not regard as amendments, and many which are not of much importance, we yet look upon the undertaking as one likely to be acceptable and useful, especially to those who have not sufficient learning or time to examine the original Scriptures for themselves; and who feel, from whatever cause, so great a respect for our received version, as not lightly to set aside its renderings. The book is handsomely printed in large octavo, and is to be completed in about twenty-four monthly parts.

Bibliotheca Sacra; or, Tracts and Essays on Topics connected with Biblical Literature and Theology. Editor: Edward Robinson, D.D., Professor of Biblical Literature in the Union Theological Seminary, New York, &c. No. I. February, 1843. pp. 204. New York and London: Wiley and Putnam.

The name of Dr. Robinson as the editor of this new periodical will at once ensure for it the favourable regard of all who are interested in Biblical literature. Though the general object of the work is the same as that of the American Biblical Repository, of which Dr. Robinson was the founder, and during the first four years of its existence the editor, it is, we suppose, intended to be conducted on a somewhat different plan, and to be much more specifically *Biblical* than the Repository has of late been. It is, says Dr. Robinson, 'intended to exhibit a full and thorough discussion of the various topics which may at any time be taken up, so as to be of permanent value as a book of reference. The nature of it is also such, that articles cannot well be divided. It will, however, be a matter of effort with the editor, to give to the work as great a variety as shall be compatible with these higher objects.' The present number contains three articles, one on the Angelology of the Old and New Testament, by Professor Stuart, and the other two on various subjects relating to Palestine, by the editor himself. These form a very important supplement to Dr. Robinson's Biblical Researches in Palestine. The former corrects, on the authority of the American missionaries, Rev. Eli Smith and Rev. S. Wolcott, various inadvertencies into which Dr. Robinson had fallen; the latter, on the reputed site of the Holy Sepulchre, is a reply to the arguments by which the Rev. J. H. Newman, of Oxford, has lately endeavoured to evade the conclusion to which Dr. Robinson's personal examination led him, that the present site must have been within the walls of the city, and therefore cannot be the place of our Lord's burial. We cordially recommend the work to all Biblical scholars.

Literary Intelligence.

In the Press.

Jamaica, its past and present state ; as to the Civil and Political History, the Intellectual, Social, Moral, and Religious State of its Inhabitants ; particularly showing the benefits resulting from the Abolition of Slavery, and the extraordinary effects of Missionary Operations. By James M. Philippo, of Spanish Town, Jamaica, nearly twenty years a missionary in that island.

Equity without Compromise ; or Hints for the Construction of a Just System of National Education. By Edward Swaine.

Just Published.

The Home ; or, Family Cares and Family Joys. By Frederika Bremer. Translated by Mary Howitt. 2 vols. 8vo.

The Sacred Writings of the New Testament. Translated from the original Greek by Drs. G. Campbell, Macknight, and Doddridge, with Prefaces, Emendations, and Appendix, by Alexander Campbell, U.S. New Edition, revised and corrected, by William Jones, A.M.

The Life of Joseph Addison. By Lucy Aikin. 2 vols. 8vo.

Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and the other British Provinces in North America, with a plan of National Colonization. By James S. Buckingham.

Fox's Book of Martyrs. Edited by Rev. John Cumming, M.A. Part XXIII.

The Scenery and Antiquities of Ireland Illustrated. Part XXIV.

The Holy Bible, accompanied with a brief Hermeneutic and Exegetical Commentary and revised version. By Rev. T. J. Hussey, D.D. Part III.

The Life and Times of John Reuchlin, or Capnion, the Father of the German Reformation. By Francis Barham, Esq.

Letters written during a Journey to Switzerland in the autumn of 1841. By Mrs. Ashton Yates. 2 vols.

Sacred Hermeneutics developed and applied : including a History of Biblical Interpretation from the earliest of the Fathers to the Reformation. By Samuel Davidson, LL.D.

The Perils of the Nation. An Appeal to the Legislature, the Clergy, and the Higher and Middle Classes.

The Influence of Aristocracies on the Revolutions of Nations, considered in relation to the present circumstances of the British Empire. By James J. Macintyre.

Le Complément du Trésor de L'Ecolier Française. By L. P. R. F. de Porquet.

The Baths of Germany considered with reference to their remedial efficacy in Chronic Diseases. With an Appendix on the Cold-water Cure, by Edwin Lee. Second Edition.

Church Music. A Sermon.

Le Trésor de L'Ecolier Française ; or translating English into French at Sight. By L. P. R. F. de Porquet. Twenty-fifth Edition.

Discourses on the Nature and Extent of the Atonement of Christ. By Ralph Wardlaw, D.D.

The Baroness. A Tale. Dedicated to the Daughters of Rank and Affluence in Great Britain.

Six Views of Infidelity. By Joseph Fletcher.

The Errors and Omissions of the Church Catechism. A Lecture delivered at Hereford. By Edward White.

An Essay on the Genealogy of the Lord Jesus Christ, with Illustrative Tables.

The Case as it is; or a Reply to the Letter of Dr. Pusey to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury. By William Goode, M.A. Third Edition.

The Speech of Right Hon. Lord Ashley, M.P., on the Suppression of the Opium Trade. Corrected by his Lordship.

A Letter to the Right Hon. and Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of London, in which the chief doctrinal points of his Lordship's recent charge are proved to be Unscriptural, Tractarian, and Popish. By Rev. James Sutcliffe, M.A.

Two Letters from Rev. H. H. Beamish, A.M., to Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D.

The Restitution of all Things. By Rev. W. Pym, M.A.

Letters on Puritanism and Nonconformity. By Sir John Bickerton Williams, Knt., LL.D., F.S.A.

Two Treatises on the Church, by Bishops Jackson and Sanderson; to which is added, A Letter of Bishop Covin on the Validity of the Orders of the Foreign Reformed Churches, with Introductory Remarks by William Goode, M.A.

The Pictorial Edition of Shakspere. William Shakspere, a Biography. Part VII.

A Dictionary, Geographical, Statistical, and Historical, of the various Countries, Places, and Principal Natural Objects in the World. Illustrated with Maps. By J. R. M'Culloch, Esq. 2 vols.

The Pictorial History of England during the Reign of George III., being a History of the People as well as of the Kingdom. By George L. Craik and C. Macfarlane. Vol. III. 1792 to 1802.

Text Book of Ecclesiastical History. By H. I. Gieseler. Translated from Third German Edition by Francis Cunningham. 3 vols.

The Popular Cyclopædia of Natural Science, Mechanical Philosophy, Horology, and Astronomy. By W. B. Carpenter, M.D.

Sea Sermons; or Plain Addresses intended for Public Worship on Board of Merchant Vessels. By Rev. Richard Marks.

History of the Hawaïan, or Sandwich Islands. By James Jackson Jarves, Member of American Oriental Society.

The Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature. By John Kitto, Editor of the Pictorial Bible. Part II.

Arts, Antiquities, and Chronology of Ancient Egypt, from Observations in 1839. By George H. Wathen, Architect, with Illustrations.

Original Letters of Eminent Literary Men of the Sixteenth, Seventeenth, and Eighteenth Centuries. With Notes and Illustrations by Sir Henry Ellisk, F.R.S.

A Hebrew Grammar, containing a Copious and Systematic Development of the Etymology and Punctuation of that Language. By Samuel Ransom.

The Last Days—their near approach and perilous character. By the Author of 'The Downfall of Popery.'

Progressive Education; or Considerations on the Course of Life. Translated from the French of Madame Necker de Saussure. Vol. III. Observations on the Life of Woman.

Letters from the Virgin Islands, illustrating Life and Manners in the West Indies.

The People's Music Book. By James Turle, Organist of Westminster Abbey, and Edward Taylor, Gresham Professor of Music. Part I.

Essay on Baptism, with some Remarks on the Doctrines of the Nicene Church, on which Puseyism is built. By Thomas Clarkson.

An Inquiry into the Accordance of War with the Principles of Christianity, and an Examination of the Philosophical Reasoning by which it is defended, with Observations on some of its causes and effects.

INDEX.

VOL. XIII. — NEW SERIES.

Ainsworth, Henry, Annotations on the Pentateuch, 721

Anti-Corn Law League and the Quarterly Review, 461; Quarterly Review, *extract, ib.;* fallacy of its arguments, 462; conduct towards the League, 463; vehement language of the League, 464; character of the League, 466; character of Cobden, 467; Sir R. Peel, 468; monopoly, 469; Sir R. Peel's assault of Mr. Cobden, 470; impossibility of suppressing the League, 471; conduct of the premier, 472; money spent by the League, *extracts,* 474; women of Manchester, 476; false charge of the Quarterly, 477; the Russell magistrates, 478; Lord Brougham, 479; his attack on Mr. Bayley, 482; affecting state of the country, 483

Anti-Slavery Cause, present state of the, publications on, 673; present aspect of the question, *ib.;* sketch of anti-slavery movements, 674, *et seq.;* London Anti-slavery Society, 678; United States, 679; British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, *ib.;* results, 681; slave population, *ib.; The Slave Trade,* 682; Spanish slave code, *extracts, ib.;* Southern States of America, *extracts,* 687; *free population, education,* 689; approaching anti-slavery convention, *extract, ib.*

Archbishop of Dublin and Bishop of London, works by, 241; importance of a correct understanding of theological terms, *ib.;* the term "church," 242; *constitution of a church,* 243; *catholic church,* 244; authority of the church, 245; protestant principle, 246; independence of the mind, 247; priesthood and apostolical succession, 248; Bishop of London's charge, 250; his inconsistencies, *ib.; extract* from Dr. Whately, 251; claims of the clergy, 252; baptismal regeneration, *extracts,* 254; ceremonial observances, *extracts,* 256; formalities hostile to religion, 258; inconsistency of Dr. Whately, 259; uselessness of established churches, 260

Aristophanes, works and translations of, 260; the heathen comedy, *ib.;* comedies of Aristophanes, 262; tragedy and drama, 263; character of the works of Aristophanes, *ib.;* his power of travestie, 265; misrepresentation of Socrates, 266; Athenian Democracy, 267; Spartans and Athenians, *extracts,* 269; aristocracy of Athens, *extract,* 271; democracy of Athens, *extract,* 273; notice of a former critique, 276; general view of the works, 278

Arnold, Dr. T., works on State and Church, 361; eminence of the author, *ib.;* his moral theory of a state, *extracts,* 362; *national authority,* 363; fallacy of his reasoning, 364; proper business of the state, 368; tendency of the church to persecution, 370; erroneous assumptions, 371; difficulties of reconciling the rights of conscience and those of the state, 373; improper claims of the state, 374; sophistry as to its union with the church, 376

Baillie, Principal, Letters and Journals of, 449; sketch of the author, *ib. et seq.;* birth, *ib.;* enters college, *ib.;* Cameron, 450; service-book, *extract,* 451; hostilities, 452; Baillie in the General Assembly, 454; Assembly of Divines, *ib.;* his return to London, 455; presbyterian persecution, *extract,* 455; feeling of the Scotch towards Cromwell, *extract,* 456; conduct towards Charles II., 458; dissolution of the General Assembly, *extract,* 459; restoration of the Stuarts, *extract,* 460; eulogium on the work, 461

Barrett, A., Catholic and Evangelical principles, 357

Baxter, Portraits of Williams and Moffat, 594

Biographical Dictionary of the Society

for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, 278; importance of such a work, 279; features of the work, *ib.*; *Abailard*, 281; *Aiguillon*, 282; *D'Alembert*, 286; *Alfred*, 288; commendation of the work, 290
Birrell, E., Memoir of, 601
Blackley, Rev. W., Lectures on Matthew, 596
Borrow, G., The Bible in Spain, 170; character of the author's works, *ib.*; voyage, 171; *boy at Mafra*, *ib.*; *Contrabandists*, 172; *druidical altar*, 173; gipsy at Badajoz, *extract*, 174; *interview with Mendizabel*, 177; *interview with Isturitz*, 179; *revolution of the Granja*, 180; *printing of the Scriptures*, 183; *scene at Ovieda*, 184; *remarkable deliverance*, 186; *sale of the Scriptures at Madrid*, 187
Bremer, Miss F., The Home, translated by Mary Howitt, 720
Brown, Dr. J., the exclusive Claims of Puseyite Episcopalians to the Christian Ministry indefensible, 654; absurdity of the new school, *ib.*; corrupt tendency of the system, 655; importance of the dissenters, 656; apostolical succession, *ib.*; requisite tests, 657; scripture doctrine of truth, 659; opposition of Puseyism to it, 660; ministry in Scripture confined to no class of men, 661; the system a fallacy, 662; theory of ordination, 663; importance of adherence to Scripture, 665; *apostolic succession incapable of proof*, 666; *testimony of Jerome*, 668; *testimony of Archbishop Usher*, 671; character of Dr. Brown's work, 672
Buckingham, J. S., The Eastern and Western States of America, 377; character and design of the work, *extract*, *ib.*; *kidnapping*, 379; *court of errors*, *morals at Boston*, 381; *lumber men*, 382; American females, *extract*, 383; state of Lowell, *extracts*, *ib.*; American tariff, *extract*, 386; political parties, *extracts*, 387; commendation of the work, 389
Buyers, Rev. W., Christianity in the East, 119

Calcott, Lady M., A Scripture Herbal, 30; character and death of the author, *ib.*; authorities, 31; importance of visiting Palestine, *ib.*; engravings, 32
Calderon, Madame, Life in Mexico, 642; sketch of Havana, *extract*, *ib.*; *General Santa Anna*, 644; *Manga de Clavo*, 645; Mexico, *extracts*, *ib.*; *singular visit*, 647; *bull fight*, 648; Mexican ladies, *extract*, 649; *taking the veil*, 650; *marauding banditti*, 653; *judicial functionary*, *ib.*; pleasing character of the work, 654
Campbell, T., Esq., Frederick the Great, his Court and Times, vols. iii. and iv., 630; conduct of Frederick towards Poland, *ib.*; sketch of Polish history, 631; *imperial diplomacy*, 633; Empress Catherine, *ib.*; vile conduct of Frederick, 635; his irreligious principles, *extracts*, 637; character of the work, 641
Candlish, Dr. R. S., Contributions towards the Exposition of the Book of Genesis, 566; character of the book, *extract*, *ib.*; spiritual tact or taste, 568; *the inspired cosmogony*, 570; *Hagar*, 571
Carpenter, Dr. L., Memoirs of, 205; evil of the personal character of controversy, *ib.*; importance of private biography, *ib.*; sketch of Dr. C., 207, *et. seq.*; birth, *ib.*; *teacher of the young*, 208; student of theology, *ib.*; views of the Trinity, *extract*, 209; removal to Birmingham, 211; *reception of diploma*, 212; residence at Exeter, 213; removal to Bristol, *ib.*; his last days, *extract*, 214; character, 216; unitarian view of worship, 218
Chapman, J. M., Brief memorials of departed saints, 595
Charge of the Bishop of London Examined, 357
Charlotte Elizabeth, Personal recollections, 290; value of anti-biography, *ib.*; sketch of the author, 291 *et seq.*; Norwich, *extracts*, *ib.*; death of her father, 293; residence in Ireland, *extract*, 294; origin of her bigotry, 295; *Dr. Hamilton*, 297; popery, *extract*, 298; catholic emancipation, *extracts*, 299; *Millenarianism*, 301; character of the volume, 303
Cheever, Rev. G., God's Hand in America, 119
Church of Scotland, publications on, 121; great importance of present movements in Scotland, *ib.*; non-intrusionists described, 123; church of Scotland, *ib.*; state of parties, *ib.*; church of Scotland's claim of right, 124; inconsistency of Dr. Chalmers, 125; leading claims of the non-intrusionists, *ib.*; origin of their claims, 127; first book of discipline, 129; second book of discipline, *ib.*; settlement of 1592, 130; era of the veto, 131; veto law, *extract*, 132; Auchterarder case, 134; Strathbogie, 135; spiritual independence, *ib.*; usage of the church, 137; failure of the proposals of the government, 138; cor-

respondence, *extracts*, 140; difficulties of the non-intrusionists, 141; "The Claim," and "The Memorial," 142; duties of the non-intrusionists 144; character of establishments, 146; Sir James Graham's letter, *ib.*

Complete Suffrage Movement, tracts on, 90; Chartism, *ib.*; origin of reforms, 91; tests to which subjected, 92; representation as the basis of government, 93; doctrine of complete suffrage, 95; origin of it in the last century, 96; reform bill, 98; people's charter, *ib.*; repeal of the Corn Laws, 99; Joseph Sturge, 100; meeting at Manchester, 102; declaration, *extract*, *ib.*; Birmingham Complete Suffrage Union, 104; conference, 105; *object of the Union*, 107; Mr. Sharman's motion, *extract*, 108; associations, 109; importance of the subject, 111; religion and politics, 112; importance of Christianity, 114

Confessions of an Apostate, 118

Cottle, J., Essays on Socinianism, 358

D'Arblay, Madame, Diary and Letters of, 353

D'Aubigné, J. H. M., History of the Reformation, vol. ii., 597

Dax, T., Letter to Lord Lyndhurst, 340; outcry against the law, *ib.*; changes, 341; imperfections of the law, 342; documents deficient in information, *ib.*; want conciseness, 343; technicality, excessive, 344; proceedings too complex, 345; division of tribunals improper, *ib.*; intervals too long, 346; right of appeal improper, 347; productive of expense and injustice, 348; propositions for reform, *ib.*

Dick, Dr. T., The Christian Philosopher, eighth edition, 718

Dissenters, conduct of, see Government Education Bill

Dissenters' Marriage Acts, 389; character of these acts, *ib.*; origin of their faults, 390; sketch of the acts, 391; objections to them, 392, *et seq.*; expense of registering chapels, *ib.*; improper claims in order to registration, *extract*, 394; demand of the registrar, 397; limited benefit accruing from a licence, 401; unequal conditions respecting the place, 402; reasons why not more generally acted on, 406; change among dissenters on the subject, 407

Ellis, Mrs., The Wives of England, 690; eminent qualifications of the author for her work, *ib.*; neglect of female education, 692; importance of marriage, 693; *confidence and truth*, 694; analysis and commendation of the volume, 696

Factories Education Bill, publications on, 573; character of the times, 574; importance of the knowledge of history, 575; Sir James Graham and his bill, *extract*, 576; interference of government with education, 578; Mr. Fox's pamphlet, 579; Prussian system, 581; character of the bill, 582; injury inflicted by it on religion, *extracts*, 583; Mr. Dunn's pamphlet, 587; Mr. Hare's Analytical Digest, 588; Mr. Baynes's *summary of objections*, *ib.*; compulsory character of the bill, *extract*, 589; Sir R. Peel's former objection to the scheme, 592; protest against the bill, 593

Family Essays, 609

Ford, Rev. D. E., Damascus, 117

Geology for Beginners, works by Richardson and others, 558; value of Mr. R.'s work, *ib.*; definition of the science disputed, 559; *fossil conchology*, 560; fossil botany, 561; fossil animal remains, *extracts*, 562; practical character of the science, *extract*, 564; character of Mr. R.'s work, *ib.*; importance of geological lectures, 565; modes of fossils, *ib.*; Sopwith's geological models, *ib.*

Godkin, Rev. J., Apostolical Christianity, 414; revival of Romanism, *ib.*; its decline on the Continent, 415; its hold on Ireland, 416; changes in that country, 417; qualifications of Mr. G. for his work, 418; analysis of the work, 419; mistakes of the author, 420; *Apostolical succession*, 421; *the Lord's Supper*, 422; transubstantiation, 423; approval of the work, 425

Government Education Bill, publications on, 697; excited state of the dissenting community, *ib.*; character of the movement, 698; presentation of petitions, *extract*, 700; Sir J. Graham's speech, *extract*, 702; opposition of public bodies to the amendments, *extracts*, 704; congregational union, *ib.*; deputies, 705; Wesleyans, *ib.*; Sunday-school Union, 707; mastership of the schools, 708; probable fate of the measure, *ib.*; Baptist union, 709; Dr. Payne's pamphlet, *extracts*, 710; church and state, 713; duties of the country, 714

Halliwell, J. O., The Nursery Rhymes of England, 602

Hannah, Rev. Dr., Memorials of Lessey, 357

Health of Towns, an examination of M'Kinnon's bill, 219; difficulties of the writer, *ib.*; comparative success, 220; *character of the witnesses examined*, 221; absurdity of Mr. M'K.'s pretensions, 223; statistical facts, 225; *consecration*, 226; *spoliation inflicted by the bill*, 227; importance of vigilance on the part of dissenters, 228

Hodgson, Rev. R., Wesleyan Methodism considered, see Wesleyan Methodism

Homes for discharged young criminals, 523; usefulness of Vingtrinier, *ib.*; demoralizing tendency of a prison, *ib.*; efforts to reclaim discharged criminals, 524; change of public feeling, 525; protection for young criminals, 526; penitentiary systems, 529; importance of introducing the system into England, *ib.*

Horner, L., Esq., Memoirs and Correspondence of Francis Horner, M.P., 506; interesting character of the work, *ib.*; sketch of its subject, 507, *et seq.*; Edinburgh Review, *extracts*, *ib.*; Brougham, *extracts*, 510; *Earl Fitzwilliam*, 512; difficulties of the Addington ministry, *extracts*, 513; the Pitt ministry, *extract*, 514; whig ministry, *extracts*, *ib.*; union of parties, *extract*, 516; *Whitbread*, 517; *Burdett*, 518; Sir S. Romilly, 519; *Jeremy Bentham*, 520; decline of Mr. Horner's health, *extracts*, *ib.*; death and character, 522

Howitt, Mary, Translation of The Neighbours, by Bremer, 116

Howitt, Mary, The Home, by do., 720

———, W., Rural and Domestic Life of Germany, 327; value of such a work, *ib.*; first impressions, *extract*, 328; *Valley of Peter*, 330; out of door life, *extract*, 331; *breaking up of the ice*, 332; private intercourse, *extract*, 333, *female education*, 335; *Uhland*, 336; *Hernhut*, 338; commendation of the work, 340

Hussey, Dr. T. J., Revised Version and Commentary on the Bible, 721

Infidelity, Course of Lectures on, 117

Intelligence, Literary, 119, 239, 359, 603, 723

Is it Good, or is it Evil? 352

Jay, Rev. W., Works of, vol. v., 352

Jay, W., War and Peace, 717

Kelly, Rev. D., Sabbath Evening Readings, 117

Kitto, John, Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature, 719

Knight, C., Library Edition of Shakspere, 33; duty of Christians in reference to authors like Shakspere, *ib.*; objectionable features in his works, 34; folly of entirely discarding writers of his class, 35; such an attempt renders curiosity more intense, 36; are read by stealth, 37; leads to excess, 38; evils of artificial ignorance are great, 39; objections replied to, 41; duties of parents and ministers, 42; conduct of the imagination, 46; qualifications of Mr. Knight as editor of Shakspere, 48; text, 52; *Stevens's edition*, *ib.*; Collyer's edition, 53; merits of Mr. Knight's edition, 54.

Kohl, J. G. Esq., Russia and the Russians in 1842, 77; great value of the work, *ib.*; *Petersburg*, 78; *Literature in Russia*, 79; education, *extracts*, 80; servants, *extracts*, 82; *Reading*, 84; the Butterweek, *extracts*, 85; *the Greek Church*, 86; *Easter*, 87; *intoxication*, 89.

Lawrance, Miss, The History of Woman in England, 548; character of Miss L.'s Memoirs of the Queens of England, *ib.*; origin of the present work, *ib.*; her eminent qualifications for the undertaking, 549; *Boadicea*, *ib.*; *Saxon women*, 551; *Ethelfleda*, 553; Norman invasion, *extract*, 554; *nuns of the middle ages*, 555; *convent schools*, 556; future volumes anticipated, 557

Layman, A, The Approaching Downfall of Popery, 355

Leifchild, Dr. J., Original Hymns adapted to general worship and special occasions, 229; improvement in congregational psalmody, *ib.*; *origin and design of the work*, 230; character of its execution, *ib.*; *Universal praise*, 231; commendation of the volume, 232

London, Bishop of, A charge delivered to the Clergy of London; see Archbishop of Dublin and Bishop of London.

Macaulay, T. B., Lays of Ancient Rome, 303; Niebuhr's history, *ib.*; early annals of Rome, *ib.*; theory of Niebuhr, Perizonius, and Macaulay, *extract*, 304; falsehood in history, 306; *Horatius Cocles*, 309; *Valerius*, 310; *Defence of the bridge*, *ib.*, *Battle of Regillus*, 312; *Virginia*, 314; character of the work, 316.

Macdonald, J., A Pastor's Memorial, 596

M'Culloch, J. R., Geographical Dictionary, 598, 716

M'Gill, Rev. J., Enter into thy Closet, 717

Mannering, Rev. E., Christian Happiness considered, 117
Manual of Devotion for individuals, 600
Marks, Rev. R., Danger and Duty, 375
Miller, E., Voice of Christ to the Churches, 596
Montgomery, J., Poetical Works of Milton, 717
Morris, A. J., Lectures by, 601
Morris, Rev. C., Funeral Sermon for Harry, 354
Mulready, W., edition of Goldsmith's Vicar of Wakefield, 350

Narrien, J., Elements of Geometry, 598
Newfoundland, Works on, by Bonnycastle and Jukes, 316; discovery of the country, *ib.*; work by Bonnycastle most original, 317; early misrule, 318; changes in administration, 319; royal charter, 320; representative assembly, *ib.*; popularity of the governor, 321; trade of Newfoundland, *extracts*, 322; *agriculture*, 325; analysis of R. Bonnycastle's work, 326
No Popery. The cry examined, 352

Paxton, Dr. G., Illustrations of Scripture Geography, 602
Phillips, Rev. E. T. M., Progressive Questioning Book, 356
Prize Essays of the Anti-Corn-Law League, 232; influence of the Corn-law on the agriculturists, *ib.*; *mode of repealing it*, 234; leases, *extract*, 263; sufferings inflicted on labourers, *extracts*, 237

Reed, Rev. Dr., The Advancement of Religion the Claim of the Times, 439; character of the book, *ib.*; general feelings as to the importance of advancing religion, 440; advances of Puseyism, 441; union of Independents and Baptists, *ib.*; their position as to missions, 444; Jamaica and Africa, 446; analysis of the work, 448
Riddle, J. E., Diamond Latin-English Dictionary, 594
Robinson, Dr. E., Bibliotheca Sacra, 722
Rogers, J., Anti-Popery, 352
Roman Catholicism, its principles and views, works on, 485; Roman-catholic reaction, *ib.*; sketch of J. de Maistre, *ib.*; his opposition to infidelity, 486; *infallibility of the Pope*, 487; fallacy of his argument, 489; unity of the church, *extract*, 490; *indulgences*, 491; auricular confession, *extract*, 493; celibacy of the priesthood, *extract*, 497; Anglican church, *extract*, 495; influence of learning, *extract*, 500; liberty of conscience, *extract*, 501; designs of the Pope, 503; increasing prevalence of popery, 505
Russell, Dr. D., on the Old and New Covenants, 718
Russell, Dr. M., Polynesia, 353
Russell, Lord John, Correspondence of John, Fourth Duke of Bedford, 55; state of parties in the first half of the eighteenth century, *ib.*; the Stuart party, *ib.*; rise of the Duke of Bedford, 56; the new ministry, 57; *Earl of Bath to the Duke of Bedford*, 58; *Earl of Leicester to the same*, 59; *Mr. Grenville to the same*, *ib.*; *letter from Mr. Legge*, 60; *defeat of the pretender*, 61; exclusion of Mr. Pitt from the ministry, *extract*, *ib.*; *naval engagement*, 62; value of the work, 63

Sabbath-School Lectures, 118
Sabbath Studies, 117
Sigourney, Mrs., Pleasant Memories of Pleasant Lands, 596
———, Poems, 2 vols., 600
Smith, Dr. W., Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology, 350
Street, Rev. H., Leaves from Eusebius, 356
Taylor, Dr. W. C., Popular History of British India, 425; seasonable appearance of the work, *ib.*; sketch of India, 427; origin of British connexion with India, *extract*, 429; East India Company, 431; Warren Hastings, *ib.*; *attack on Seringapatam*, 434; government of Lord Cornwallis, *ib.*; Lord Minto, 435; Marquis of Hastings, 436; Lord W. Bentinck, *extract*, *ib.*; Lord Auckland, 438
Taylor, H., Edwin the Fair, 409; plan of the poem, 410; Leolf, 411; *Seashore near Hastings*, 412; *Elgiva and Edwin*, *ib.*; commendation of the work, 414
Temple, Rev. E., Sermons and Memoir, 355
Tholuck, Dr. A., miscellaneous writings of, 147; German collections of occasional treatises, *ib.*; eminence of Dr. T., 149; periodical work conducted by him, *ib.*; analysis of the volume, 150, *et seq.*; evidences of Christianity, 151; Grotius, 152; English apologists of the seventeenth century, 154; Locke, *ib.*; Paley, 155; Butler, 156; French apologists, *ib.*; German apologists, 157; *Leibnitz*, *ib.*; etymology of the word Jehovah, *extracts*, 159; revolution in German theology, 161; *theologians*, 162; Wolfian philosophy, 163; diffusion of the writings of

English deists, 165; the Voltaire school, *ib.*; infidelity of Frederick the Great, *ib.*; Semler, *extract*, 166; satisfaction with the work, 169
Todd, Dr. J. H., an apology for the Lollard Doctrines, and the Last Age of the Church; see the Wycliffe Manuscripts
Truman, Joseph, the Great Propitiation, 354

Vaughan, Rev. H., Memoir and Remains of, 357
Vaughan, Dr. R., The Modern Pulpit viewed in its relation to Society, 189; recent attention devoted to the subject, *ib.*; analysis of the volume, *ib.*, *et seq.*; difficulty of the subject, *ib.*; independence of the work, 190; influence of society on the pulpit, 191; adaptation of the pulpit to changes of society, *ib.*; origin of preaching, 192; importance of the pulpit to the working classes, 193; remedies for existing evils, 194; *erroneous estimate of the popular understanding*, 195; qualifications essential to the ministry, 197; acquaintance with the state of intellect, *ib.*; science of general teaching, 198; manner in the pulpit, 199; *deficiency of the pulpit*, 201; the pulpit and the higher classes, *extract*, *ib.*; the pulpit in relation to the past, 202; suggestions as to the improvement of the pulpit, 203
Vinet, Professor, Work on Church and State, 605; rapid progress of the question, *ib.*; feelings of the members of establishments, 606; Scottish establishment, 607; Puseyite faction, 608; Oxford Tracts, *extracts*, 609; State protection and interference, *extracts*, 611; Times, *extract*, 615; character and analysis of Vinet's work, 616; *Has not the Church need of the State?* 617; *Has not the State need of the Church?* 623; *importance of preparation for change*, 625; announcement of an English translation of the work, 629

Wesleyan Methodism, its position and policy, 64; controversies of the times, *ib.*; origin of Wesleyan tracts for the times, 65; Mr. Wesley's ecclesiastical views, 66; Wesleyans not dissenters, *extracts*, 67; ministerial orders, 68; extraordinary claims, 69; serious position of the Conference, 70; Mr. Hodgson's appeal, 75; importance of the movement, 76
Whately, Archbishop, The Kingdom of Christ delineated; see Archbishop of Dublin and Bishop of London
Wilkinson, H. W., Memoirs of the Life and Ministry of the late Rev. W. Wilkinson, 530; sketch of Mr. W.'s life, *ib.*, *et seq.*; Bartholomew church, *extracts*, 532; *theological views*, 533; death, *ib.*; character, 534; *searching the scriptures*, 535; author's misrepresentations of dissenters, 536; evils arising from the conduct of evangelical clergymen, 538
Winslow, Rev. O., Eminent Holiness essential to an efficient ministry, 595
Wycliffe Manuscripts, the, 1; MS. of Wycliffe in Trinity College, *ib.*; accounts furnished by Drs. Todd and Vaughan, *extracts*, 2; erroneous statements of Dr. T., 3; objections to his view, 4; inconsistency of the work with Wycliff's known sentiments, 6; character of the Lollard controversy, 12; Wycliffe's Last Age of the Church, 13; complaints against Dr. T., *ib.*; his unchristian temper, 14; *extract* from Dr. Groneman, 15; misrepresentation of Dr. Vaughan, 17; *Letter of Dr. Vaughan to the British Magazine*, 19; Dr. Todd's reply, *extracts*, 24; detraction of high church writers, 28; Dr. Vaughan's connexion with the review of the works, 29
Wylie, Rev. J. A., The Modern Judea, Ammon, Moab, and Edom, compared with Ancient Prophecy, 538; increased knowledge of the Holy Land, *ib.*; Turkish jealousy, 539; character of the work, *ib.*; *social condition of Judea*, 540; present condition of Ammon, *extract*, 544; Moab and Edom, 547; interesting character of the work, 548

END OF VOL. XIII.

T. C. Savill, Printer, 107, St. Martin's Lane, Charing Cross.